THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN

8

NUMBER 8 · OCTOBER 1935

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS

Presenting material from the

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY

Issued in coöperation with the

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON
LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN

NUMBER 8 : OCTOBER, 1935

ALMA COLLEGE
P
LIBRARY
HLB
Alma California

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1935

33801

V. 8
1935:2

COPYRIGHT, 1935
BY THE PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE

PRINTED AT THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U. S. A.

Contents

The Manuscripts of *Piers Plowman* in the Huntington Library, and Their Value for Fixing the Text of the Poem . .	*R. W. Chambers*	3
The Christian Muse	*Lily B. Campbell*	29
Jaques	*Oscar James Campbell*	71
Wit, "Mixt Wit," and the Bee in Amber	*W. Lee Ustick* and *Hoyt H. Hudson*	103
"Timon's Villa" and Cannons	*George Sherburn*	131
Notes:		
Letters of Henry St. John to James Brydges	*Godfrey Davies* and *Marion Tinling*	153
A Project for a California Slave Colony in 1851	*John C. Parish*	171
List of Contributors		177

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN

NUMBER 8 OCTOBER, 1935

The Manuscripts of *Piers Plowman* in the Huntington Library, and Their Value for Fixing the Text of the Poem

By R. W. CHAMBERS

IT IS not possible to estimate the value, for the criticism of the text of *Piers Plowman*, of the Huntington Library manuscripts, without some discussion of the principles underlying textual criticism. It is obvious that the phrase "a good manuscript" depends on the point of view — but to how great an extent is not always realized. A manuscript which is of the highest value as an example of handwriting or illumination, may nevertheless be transcribed from an inaccurate original, and therefore may be of little or no value for the purpose of editing a critical text; and the converse is equally the case. If the original from which the Lindisfarne Book was transcribed could be found, it would certainly prove to be a manuscript altogether inferior, from the standpoint of art. But, if complete, it would, for the purpose of fixing the text of the Vulgate, necessarily have greater value than the Lindisfarne Book, which can only repeat what it derived from its original, plus a certain inevitable number of errors. Nevertheless, editors have felt a natural — often subconscious — preference for a well written manuscript, and have sometimes given to one particular

manuscript, because it is beautifully written, a place which the accuracy or inaccuracy of its wording does not justify. We shall find a Huntington Library copy of *Piers Plowman* (numbered *HM 137*) to be an example of this. On the other hand, a manuscript which has little value either from the artistic point of view or from that of constructing a critical text, may yet have philological value. Another Huntington Library copy of *Piers Plowman* (numbered *HM 114*) is artistically an undistinguished manuscript, and it has passed through the hands of an unfaithful scribe who has systematically substituted commonly understood words for the more archaic ones. As a text of *Piers Plowman*, it is peculiarly inaccurate; but, however little value it may have to an editor, it might prove of great interest to a philologist who was tracing the history of the English vocabulary. For the scribe's treatment of the difficult words which he found before him in his text shows how far he still understood them, or expected them to be clear to his readers; it is therefore good evidence for the obsolescence of certain words. Even from the very specialized point of view of value in fixing a critical text, the "goodness" of a manuscript is often not a consistent feature, but is apt to vary in different sections. And it is important to notice that a manuscript may be "good," in that it reproduces very accurately what we believe to have been the author's wording, but "bad" in that it departs widely from what we believe to have been his spelling and his grammatical forms.

The controversy as to the authorship of *Piers Plowman* fortunately does not apply to the fundamental facts of the text, which have been accepted equally by Skeat and by Manly, and are indeed beyond dispute.[1]

Piers Plowman is extant in three main versions. The shortest (the *A-text*) was written not long after 1362. This is proved by its allusions to contemporary events. The *A-text* is incomplete and breaks off suddenly, leaving unanswered the questions which the author has raised, as to whether good works will secure the salvation of the righteous. The age-old problems of predestination, and faith as against

[1] Like all other things, the existence and order of the three texts have of course been disputed, but never by anyone who has consulted the manuscripts. It is curious that there are some eminent scholars who do not know that, before disputing about a manuscript, it is desirable to have seen it.

works, proved too much for the dreamer, and he abandoned his poem in despair.

The second, or *B-text*, follows the *A-text*, with constant additions and alterations, till it reaches the point where the *A-text* had suddenly broken off. It then takes up the problems which had been raised and abandoned, expresses the deep regret of the dreamer for his hasty words and for the abandonment of his search, and discusses at length and solves all the problems raised in the *A-text;* it then continues, and concludes the search for *Do-well*, *Do-better*, *and Do-Best*. Its allusions to contemporary affairs fix the date of the *B-text* after 1376–77.

The *C-text* is a new recension of the *B-text*, made, as is shown by its allusions, at a date when the rule of Richard II was causing dissatisfaction.

W. W. Skeat, when making his great edition of *Piers Plowman*, never doubted that the three texts were the work of one man, and never discussed seriously the problem which earlier scholars, like Wright and Marsh, had raised, as to whether the reviser who made the *C-text* was identical with the writer of the *B-text*. The *A-text* was Skeat's discovery, and he assumed, without discussion, that it was the work of the same author, William Langland, who, he thought, wrote the other two texts.

Professor Manly, on the other hand, has divided *Piers Plowman* among five authors,[1] and other writers have since tried to carry the division still further, making six or more different authors.[2]

Before we can dispute profitably about authorship, we must first get, as a foundation, a correct text. The question of authorship can therefore be left out of consideration here — we are engaged in surveying and collecting material upon which it may later become possible to argue. (I believe that the evidence is conclusive that the *A-text* and the *B-text* are both the work of one author, whose name was William Langland, but that the question of the authorship of the *C-text* is one which still needs further investigation. But this is a per-

[1] "The Lost Leaf of 'Piers the Plowman,'" *Modern Philology*, III, 359–66; "Piers the Plowman and Its Sequence," in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, where Professor Manly divides the *A-text* between two authors, A1 and A2, and attributes the *B-text* and the *C-text* to distinct writers. A certain John But, who indisputably added some lines to a manuscript of the *A-text*, makes the fifth writer.

[2] Dr. Mabel Day, in *Modern Language Review*, XVII, 403–9, argues for six authors.

sonal view; in what follows I leave the whole question of authorship entirely open, keeping as far as possible away from any controversial problems.)

Unfortunately, the mere settling of the text of the poem provides us with problems of sufficient difficulty.

All three texts, *A*, *B*, and *C*, are extant in a large number of manuscripts. What a great Latin scholar has said with regard to classical texts is equally true of medieval texts:

> Some ancient authors have descended to modern times in one manuscript only. . . . Others there are whose text, though in the main reposing on a single copy, can be corrected here and there from others, inferior indeed, but still independent and indispensable. . . . There is a third class whose text comes down from a remote original through separate channels, and is preserved by manuscripts of unlike character but like fidelity, each serving, in its turn, to correct the faults of others.
>
> If I had no judgment, and knew it, and were nevertheless immutably resolved to edit a classic, I would single out my victim from the first of these three classes: that would be best for the victim and best for me. Authors surviving in a solitary manuscript are by far the easiest to edit, because their editor is relieved from one of the most exacting offices of criticism, from the balancing of evidence and the choice of variants. They are the easiest, and for a fool they are the safest. One field at least for the display of folly is denied him: others are open, and in defending, correcting, and explaining the written text he may yet aspire to make a scarecrow of the author and a by-word of himself; but with no variants to afford him scope for choice and judgment, he cannot exhibit his impotence to judge and choose.[1]

The difficulties of editing an author whose works are extant in a large number of manuscripts with wide variations are indeed enormous. A certain number of the variations are obvious blunders such as no editor should admit into his text, and no manuscript of *Piers Plowman*, not even the best, is free from such blunders. But, in the case of the majority of the variants in *Piers Plowman*, we have two or more readings, each of which, from the standpoint of meter and sense, is admissible. The same is true of many other Middle English texts; the cases where both readings are, on a priori grounds, equally good,

[1] Manilius, ed. A. E. Housman (London, 1903), pp. xxx–xxxi.

and where we have consequently nothing to guide us save the authority of the manuscripts, are more common in Middle English than in classical texts. Our difficulties only begin when the comparatively easy labor of collating all the manuscripts is finished. How can we discover where manuscript authority resides?

The most obvious method is to count the manuscripts, and follow the majority. And there are some cruces, in some authors, with regard to which an editor may be driven to this democratic way of solving the problem. Indeed, if every manuscript were copied direct from the author's autograph, there would be a great deal to be said for this method, in certain cases. But how fallacious it is apt to be, we can discover by turning to cases where one reading can, on intrinsic grounds, be proved to be right. The *Divine Comedy* is extant in a great number of manuscripts, and hundreds of these have been collated in difficult passages. There are instances where only a small minority gives the reading which is certainly right, and the overwhelming majority gives the reading which is certainly wrong.

This is natural, because most manuscripts have reached us at the end of a long chain of transcriptions, and cases are rare in which there is even a presumption that the extant manuscript is in the author's handwriting, or copied direct from the author's handwriting. Scribes' manuscripts are mainly copied from one another.

Hence comes the value of the genealogical method. Suppose two copies, "a" and "b," made by equally reliable (or equally unreliable) scribes from the author's autograph; "a" we may suppose to be copied again and again, till it is finally lost or destroyed. But, though "a" itself is destroyed, it may be represented by (shall we say) a dozen extant descendants. The other manuscript, "b," may leave no extant descendants, but may happen by exceptional luck to be itself preserved. There will in this case be thirteen extant manuscripts, and one of them, "b," will be worth more than all the remaining twelve put together. For the most careful comparision of the twelve descendants of the lost "a" can, at best, only enable us to arrive at what was in the lost "a," and there will be some doubt and dispute even about that, because we have to reconstruct the lost "a" conjecturally from his descendants. But "b" is extant, and can speak for himself. We have supposed that the lost "a" and the extant "b" were of equal value:

"b" is therefore of more value than all the twelve other extant manuscripts put together. For, even when these agree, they can only give us what "a" handed down to them; and there will be some cases where they disagree so seriously that there will be doubt even about that.

Or suppose (and this is a much more common case) that "b" is also lost, having left (shall we say) two descendants. These two descendants, who give us the lost "b," would be equal in value to the twelve who give us the lost "a," except in so far as we may be able to get a better idea of "a" from his twelve descendants than of "b" from his two. In cases where the twelve descendants of "a" agree upon one reading, and the two descendants of "b" agree upon another, each reading being inherited from the common ancestor "a" or "b," the rival readings must have equal textual authority, if the lost "a" and the lost "b" were equally good manuscripts. The fact that twelve extant manuscripts give one reading, and two another, is irrelevant; each group gives us the reading of its original. So our first principle is that, if there are two families of manuscripts, each representing (so far as we can gather) a tradition of equal value, the fact that one family is extant in a much greater number of manuscripts does not make its tradition better, though it may make that tradition easier to determine.

It is interesting to trace how editors gradually came to recognize the importance of the genealogical method of studying manuscripts. Erasmus, when he edited the New Testament, had no conception of this method, and indeed, if he had realized its importance, the field was so vast that he could not, single-handed, have used it effectively. In course of time, however, scholars came to see that there were certain manuscripts which often agreed in readings that were certainly wrong. (These were of course manuscripts derived from what we should now call the same, or closely related, families.) There were other manuscripts which, whatever might be their individual errors, seldom *agreed* upon erroneous readings. Such manuscripts obviously belonged to distinct families, and the reading which is supported by the greatest number of distinct families is likely to be the original one. So the genealogical method was gradually worked out, and the critical texts of modern scholars are based upon the fact stated by

Westcott and Hort: "All textual transmission takes the form of a genealogical tree, diverging into smaller and smaller branches, of which the extant documents are casual and scattered fragments." The recognition of this fact has enabled scholars to dismiss thousands of false readings from the texts which they have edited. Yet we have only to look at the critical texts of the New Testament to see that, though the editors may all agree in rejecting readings which satisfied Erasmus, they are far from having attained certainty or unanimity among themselves.

If every scribe had copied the text before him, merely adding his own careless blunders, all would, comparatively speaking, be well. It would then be possible, by observing the mistakes which each manuscript has inherited from its ancestors, to reconstruct the families. The problem, as explained, for example, by Dr. Thomas Knott, or by Professor Grattan and myself, in our papers on the manuscripts of *Piers Plowman*, written between twenty and thirty years ago, would then be simple.[1]

"Two or more manuscripts, or two or more groups of manuscripts, are assigned to a hypothetically constructed ancestor, or archetype, if they possess in common a number of clear errors, omissions and additions." Then the genealogical tree of the extant manuscripts can be plotted. If there are several lines of descent, and all but one agree, the many families are likely to be right against the one family. If the evidence is balanced between two families, then the family which we have found generally to have the smaller number of errors is (other things being equal) to be followed, because "as a matter of probability, it is less likely to be in error."

But the problem is more complicated than it seemed to us a quarter of a century ago. The trouble comes when the scribe, instead of copying to the best of his power the text he finds before him, tries to improve on it:

> The modern editor asks of the scribe first that he be faithful; secondly that he be stupid; a scribe who uses his intelligence upon the text he is copying is only a source of trouble. Even if the passage be hopelessly corrupt, if

[1] R. W. Chambers and H. G. Grattan, "The Text of Piers Plowman," *Modern Language Review*, IV (1909), etc.; Thomas A. Knott, "An Essay toward the Critical Text of the A-Version of 'Piers the Plowman,'" *Modern Philology*, XII, 389–421.

the scribe will but transcribe it faithfully, it is likely enough that he will give a clue to the modern editor; for the modern editor has often the advantage of comparing many other manuscripts which were not accessible to the scribe. But the scribe who substitutes something which is not in the copy before him, but which he thinks the author ought to have written, simply mangles the evidence which he ought to have handed on to the modern editor. If the scribe could rise from his grave, he would of course reply that he had no thought of making things convenient for the modern editor; he was trying to make the text intelligible for the man of his own generation who would have to read it; but the fact remains that *for our purpose* the good scribe, like the good modern printer, is the man who follows his copy even if it flies out of the window.

Perhaps the most remarkable example of scribal intelligence which I have ever met, occurs [1] in the Huntington Library manuscript *HM 128*. The author of *Piers Plowman* wished to date an event by Anno Domini and by the lord mayor of the year, Chichester, who had held office from October, 1369, to October, 1370. But this date did not fit into an alliterative line, where at least one of the accented words in each half line ought to begin with the same letter. So the author wrote that the event happened in April of the year of our Lord (not 1370, but) "A *th*ousand, *th*ree hundred, twice *th*irty and ten, . . . when Chichester was mayor." But, by a widespread scribal error, found in two of the three families of manuscripts of the *B-text*, "twenty" was substituted for "thirty." This would not suit either the event, or the mayoralty of Chichester. The manuscript *HM 128* should have shared this error, "twice twenty," with the other members of its family, i.e., *W* and the Crowley reprint. But *HM 128* has passed through the hands of intelligent correctors who have altered the line from

"A thowsand and thre hundryd twice twenty and ten"

to something which has been erased and is not now legible, and then to

"A thowsand and thre hundryd syxty and nyne."

We also find written in the margin, in arabic figures, the date 1369. So some fifteenth-century corrector was sufficiently well informed to

[1] Fol. 167v.

know the date when the mayoralty of Chichester began, although his correction is not quite in accordance with fact, since the event referred to (a failure of the April rains, and a consequent drought) actually took place in the latter part of Chichester's mayoralty, in 1370.

But, to the editor who is striving to arrive at the original wording of the poem, such alterations as these cause trouble. They obscure the textual history of the manuscript, and make it difficult to put it in its correct place in the genealogy of the manuscripts. And so, even in the cases when the corrector makes an alteration which, in itself, is right, he is apt to add to the editor's problems by concealing the truth as to manuscript relationship. But the alteration which the corrector makes is generally wrong; he usually substitutes something which, though it often gives good smooth sense, is not what the poet actually wrote, and which conceals from us altogether what it *was* that the poet originally wrote, in a way that the error which the scribe has corrected would not have done.

That is why those manuscripts are so important which give us an unmixed tradition — or, if that be too much to hope for, a tradition as little mixed as may be. Manuscripts where the original readings have been erased, and other readings written in, are unsatisfactory, even if the new readings that have been written in are in themselves more correct than those that have been erased. But still more unsatisfactory are manuscripts which have been copied from such corrected manuscripts, because in those copies the secondary, corrected, reading is naturally the one to be transcribed, without anything to warn us that it *is* secondary.

The result is that a manuscript which clearly belongs to one family may show us, from time to time, transient signs of being connected with a second family, because an ancestor has been corrected from a manuscript of that second family. This may go so far that the manuscript becomes entirely "contaminated," and, for purposes of fixing the text, almost worthless. As the classical critic, already once quoted, has put it, "Lections are bandied to and fro from one copy to another, and all the streams of tradition are united by canals." [1]

[1] A. E. Housman, in his edition of *Juvenal*, p. xxiv. Here, again, the problems of text-editing differ. In *Piers Plowman*, in spite of mixture, families of manuscripts can be made

Rather different from these cases of complete mixture are the cases where a manuscript belongs consistently to one family, and then suddenly changes, and passes over consistently to another. We can see how this could happen. At the monastery of Cluny, a bear invaded one of the outlying hermitages and found the hermit reading the correspondence of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. The hermit fled, but the bear ate the first part of the correspondence. Ultimately, the damaged manuscript was recovered, and Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, wrote to Guigo, prior of the Grande Chartreuse, to borrow his copy of the correspondence, so that the missing portion might be made good. When this repaired manuscript was in its turn copied, the copy would be, in its opening pages, descended from the Chartreuse manuscript, and then, without anything to show why the change should take place, it would become a descendant of the Cluny manuscript. Three manuscripts of the *B-text* of *Piers Plowman* have been copied from an original of which the opening sections have been lost, and have been supplied from a *C-text*. Probably the cause of the mixture of the texts was in that case less exciting.

In one respect the editing of Middle English texts is much more difficult than that of classical ones. The spelling of Ciceronian Latin, or New Testament Greek, is, in the main, settled; so is the grammar. But there is a great deal of uncertainty as to the spelling, dialect, and grammatical forms of *Piers Plowman*. The spelling and the grammatical forms of the different manuscripts vary widely, quite as much as the wording does; but they vary independently of the wording, so that the manuscript that is most faithful in its wording is not necessarily the one which is most faithful in its grammatical forms. It is possible, in theory at any rate, to reconstruct the original wording, by a comparison of the different manuscripts, substituting in our basic manuscript the wording of other manuscripts, whenever that seems preferable, till we achieve an eclectic wording which would be the same, whatever manuscript we had originally selected as the base.

out much more clearly than in the *Divine Comedy*, or, to judge from Housman's words, than in most classical writers. And the sphere "within which the authority of better manuscripts is properly and usefully invoked" is far less narrow in *Piers Plowman* than in classical texts, because the cases are much more numerous where on intrinsic grounds "there is not a pin to choose" between rival readings.

But we cannot do that with regard to the spelling and the grammatical forms; all we can do is to select a manuscript, which, so far as we can judge, does not differ seriously in spelling and dialect from what we believe to have been the usage of the original poet, and to follow in these particulars the manuscript which we have chosen. Therefore, it is important to select as our basic manuscript one which is as free as possible from eccentricities of spelling and of grammar, even though in actual wording it may not be superior, or may even be a little inferior, to a rival manuscript. We shall see later that this has a very definite bearing on the value of the Huntington Library manuscript *HM 143*.

The A-Text

There are, altogether, sixteen manuscripts of the *A-text*, but there are none in the Huntington Library, so that the problems of this text do not immediately concern us.

The B-Text

The *B-text* was the first version of *Piers Plowman* to be printed (by Robert Crowley, in 1550, from a manuscript no longer extant). The manuscript must have been a good one, for Crowley's text is of value, despite all the corruptions due to its having been printed nearly two centuries after *Piers Plowman* was first written. If we count Crowley's reprint as representing a lost manuscript, there are, in all, sixteen manuscripts of the *B-text*.[1]

These sixteen manuscripts fall into three groups. Each group derives its peculiarities from the fact that its members have been, directly or indirectly, copied from one archetype, from which each group has inherited the erroneous readings that distinguish it. Of course every manuscript has its own individual errors, and within these three main groups some subgroups can be distinguished by the

[1] On the other hand, MS *Caius College, Cambridge, No. 201*, is not, strictly speaking, a manuscript at all. It is merely a transcript of Roger's printed edition of 1561, which itself is a poor reprint of Crowley's third issue. It is therefore textually quite worthless. MS *James 2*, in the Bodleian, is not counted here. It is a modern transcript of a few hundred lines, from a manuscript not now forthcoming, and is of no assistance in fixing the text of *Piers*.

peculiarities which the manuscripts of each subgroup derive from their parent.

To the first main group belongs *L* (*Bodleian Library, Laud Misc., 581*). It was upon this manuscript that Skeat based his edition of the *B-text*. Skeat had an exaggerated idea of its value; at one time he believed it to be actually the author's autograph — a belief which is quite untenable, and which he afterwards abandoned. It remains probable, however, that *L* is the best manuscript of the *B-text*, and that it should continue to be used as the basis of the critical text in any future edition.

There are three other manuscripts closely allied to *L*. These are *M*, *R*, and *F*. *M* (*British Museum, Additional 35287*) was formerly *Ashburnham 129*, and, after the Ashburnham manuscripts were sold, passed to the British Museum, as the other Ashburnham *Piers Plowman* (*Ashburnham 130*) ultimately did to the Huntington Library. *M* was originally an excellent manuscript, but its genuine readings have been frequently erased. Still, the words which have been written in, over erasures, can easily be distinguished from the original text. An examination under ultraviolet rays might perhaps reveal more of the original script.

Less valuable are *R* (*Bodleian, Rawlinson Poet. 38*) and the much inferior *F* (*Corpus Christi College, 201*), both at Oxford. They form a subgroup of the same main group as *L*; they are derived from an original which had been corrected from other manuscripts, including an *A-text* and a *C-text*. But this original has been lost, and in the surviving copies, *R* and *F*, these corrections and additions cannot be distinguished *paleographically*, as they can in the case of *M*. Accordingly, *R* and *F* present us with texts which are highly composite, but which have a deceptive appearance of homogeneity, and are consequently misleading. They misled Skeat into inserting, into his critical *B-text*, lines which had no business there: lines which really belonged to the *C-text*, but which had been written into the ancestor of *R* and *F*, and from that ancestor had been copied into those manuscripts. Because *R* and *F* are, in the main, manuscripts of the *B-text*, Skeat treated all the lines they contain as *B*-lines. This is a mistake which he could not have made if the original of *R* and *F* had been extant, showing how these lines, really characteristic of a *C-text*, had been copied from such

a text into a *B*-manuscript. *L*, therefore, is the one good manuscript of this first group, supported, not very effectively, by *M*, while *R* and *F* give us a composite tradition which is likely to mislead. They can be used only with great caution.

The bulk of the manuscripts of the *B-text* belong to the second main group. The best examples of this group are *Y*, at Newnham College, Cambridge,[1] and *O*, at Oriel College, Oxford (*No. 79*). Both these are excellent manuscripts, though probably inferior to *L*. Subsidiary members of this second group are *B* (*Bodley, 814*), at Oxford, *Bm* (*Additional 10574*) and *Cot.* (*Caligula, A. xi*), in the British Museum, and three manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library, *C* (*Dd. 1. 17*), C_2 (*Ll. 4. 14*), and *G* (*Gg. 4. 31*).

A single excellent manuscript — *Trinity College, Cambridge, B. 15. 17* — constitutes the third type of the *B-text*. It was printed by Wright in 1842, and is therefore known as *W*. *W* is almost, though probably not quite, as good a manuscript as *L*. The manuscript printed by Crowley was akin to *W*. But, since we can only know this manuscript through Crowley's mid-sixteenth-century reprint, its value is altogether less than that of *W*.

Skeat, then, was probably right in choosing to base his text upon *L*. Future critical editions will differ from Skeat's text chiefly in that the editors will not give to *L* such implicit confidence as did Skeat. *L* is indeed a good manuscript; but it represents only one of three traditions. It has to be constantly corrected from manuscripts representing the other two main groups. If *L* is supported by the manuscripts of the second group, represented best by *Y* and *O*, or of the third group, represented by *W*, it is almost certain to give the correct reading. But, if those two main groups are in agreement, against the reading offered by *L* and its group, *they* are likely to be correct. Broadly, two groups of *B*-manuscripts carry it against the third.

L, representing the first group, *Y* and *O* representing the second, and *W* representing the third, are therefore the four essential manuscripts of the *B-text*. But, although they are good manuscripts, they are very far indeed from being identical with the archetypal manuscripts of the three main groups which these four represent. For each

[1] This manuscript formerly belonged to Mr. Yates Thompson, by whom it was given to Newnham — hence its designation "*Y*."

of these four manuscripts has its individual mistakes, made by the scribe who wrote it, and has other mistakes, inherited from the intermediate copies which intervened (for example) between the actual *L* (*Laud, 581*), preserved in the Bodleian Library, and the archetypal ancestor of the main group to which *L* belongs. For the actual manuscripts which we possess are seldom direct copies of the archetype. They are the last of a line of manuscripts, and every scribe, between the original author and the manuscript now extant in a library, has made his contribution of errors, some great, some small. Occasionally, a scribe's error was so palpable that a succeeding scribe has been able to correct it; but, generally speaking, an extant manuscript has a body of mistakes which have been contributed by all the scribes in the series which connects the extant manuscript with the author's lost original copy. And so, while *L* representing the first group, *Y* and *O* representing the second group, and *W* representing the third, are the essential manuscripts for the *B-text*, nevertheless each has its individual mistakes, and we need subsidiary manuscripts to show us when these four primary manuscripts are really speaking for the group to which they belong.

L, we have seen, is not very well supported by its nearest relatives, which have been in different ways seriously corrupted; nor is *W* very well supported by the late Crowley reprint. *Y* and *O*, on the other hand, receive considerable checking and support from the other manuscripts of their group, *Cot.*, *Bm*, *B*, *C*, C_2, and *G*. From a comparison of all these manuscripts, it ought to be possible to form a very good idea of the readings of the lost archetypal manuscript from which that group descended.

It remains to decide what is the place in this scheme of the two Huntington Library manuscripts of the *B-text*: *HM 128* (formerly *Ashburnham 130*) [1] and *HM 114* (formerly *Phillipps 8252*). *HM 128* is a volume which contains, in addition to *Piers Plowman*, Hampole's

[1] The number CXXIX, stamped on the back of the binding of this manuscript, is misleading. The figure gives the number which the manuscript bore, not in the collection of Lord Ashburnham, but in that of Mr. J. B. B. Clarke, who owned it about a century ago. It is a mere accident (though an odd one) that Lord Ashburnham's two *Piers Plowman* manuscripts formed 129 and 130 of his collection, and that the second of these had been 129 in Mr. Clarke's collection and is now *HM 128* in the Huntington Library.

Prick of Conscience, the alliterative *Siege of Jerusalem*, and other shorter things. It is in a Tudor binding. The text of *Piers Plowman* contained in *HM 128* is allied to *W* and to the Crowley reprint (subsequently referred to as *Cr.*). This is clear from the fact that they all agree in omitting certain lines, which must have been missing in the archetypal manuscript from which they are all derived.[1] There are also a number of minor errors[2] common to *W*, *Cr.*, and *HM 128*. There is a striking error in the first line of *HM 128*:

"In a someres seysoun whan set was the sunne".

Here "set" is, of course, a blunder for "soft"; the sun was not "set": we are told four lines below that it was a "May morning." This error is not shared by *W*, but it is found in *Cr.*, and was presumably in the manuscript from which Crowley printed. But *HM 128* is not the manuscript he used, because it has very many mistakes from which his reprint is free. The most striking of these is the omission of some three hundred lines after XI, 106, and their insertion, in two sections, at later points.[3] This transposition is not found in *Cr.*, and it cannot have been in the manuscript from which Crowley printed, because, when he brought out his first edition, he had not sufficient knowledge of the poem to have put these misplaced passages back in their right place. Therefore, he cannot have been printing from *HM 128*. But, indeed, the evidence that *Cr.* was not made from *HM 128* appears on almost every page. The same applies also to *W*. The original from

[1] For example: Prologue, 170; I, 145; II, 186; XII, 105; XV, 367.

[2] For example: Prologue, 27, 69, 149, 162; II, 99, 134, 136; IX, 93; XII, 48, 240; XVIII, 109, 297.

[3] Skeat, in his text, does not count the Latin quotations, and has inserted some spurious lines; consequently the numbering of his lines somewhat obscures the close correspondence of the length of these misplaced passages. This misplacement can be explained if we suppose that the archetype had an average of 52 lines to a page. The leaves next to the innermost of a section must have got wrongly folded, and instead of being bound A B C D they are bound D B C A. The leaf "A" contained two pages of 51 lines each (XI, 106–211); "B" and "C" contained in all two pages of 51 and two pages of 52 lines each (XI, 212-414), and "D" contained two pages of 53 lines each (XI, 415–XII, 83). The same result would be obtained if the archetype had been (as it may have been) a smaller manuscript with an average of 26 lines to a page, the leaves running a b c d e f g h; a b g h may have been folded wrongly, and the manuscript bound g h c d e f a b. An actual example of a similar misfolding is found in a Huntington Library manuscript of the *C-text* of *Piers Plowman* (*HM 143*). In one section the two innermost leaves (now numbered 60 and 61) have been wrongly folded, so that what is now folio 61 (XIV, 207–XV, 24) must be read first, and then folio 60 (XV, 25–91).

which *W*, *HM 128*, and *Cr.* are derived must have been a very good manuscript. It had comparatively few errors to transmit to its descendants, so that their relationship is not marked by any very frequent common errors, although these errors, when they do occur, make a common origin certain. Apart from these not very numerous errors which they share with each other, *W*, *HM 128*, and *Cr.* have a large number of individual errors.

A comparison of *W*, *HM 128*, and *Cr.*, throughout the Prologue, shows that, in addition to their common mistakes, *W* seems to be in error 12 times, *HM 128* 48 times, and *Cr.* 43 times.[1] It would seem, then, that the text given by *HM 128* is about as reliable as *Cr.*, but much less reliable than *W*. But, since manuscripts so often vary in their accuracy in different parts of the poem, it is necessary to compare further before deciding definitely on the inferiority of *HM 128* to *W*. In addition to the Prologue, I have examined Passus IV, Passus XI, and Passus XX, and the inferiority is shown throughout, though with some fluctuation:

	HM 128 right against *W*	*HM 128* wrong against *W*
Prologue	12	48
Passus IV	3	37
Passus XI	15	65
Passus XX	23	33
Total	53	183

It would appear, then, that, in addition to the errors which *HM 128* and *W* share with one another, and in virtue of which they can be classed together, they vary from each other in a very large number of cases, and that in such variations *W* appears to be right, and *HM 128* wrong, in at least three cases out of four.

So far as the accuracy of its text goes, there is perhaps not much to choose between *HM 128* and *Cr.* But, in spelling, *HM 128* is, of course, very much nearer the original than *Cr.*, and, taken as a whole, it is a more important document for fixing the text. *HM 128* has suffered very much at the hands of a corrector, and is full of erasures.

[1] As these instances will appear in the collations of the *B-text*, when published, they are not enumerated here in detail.

Some of these are unimportant. When the scribe or corrector found that a line had been omitted, he rubbed out the whole passage (perhaps ten or a dozen lines) so as to be able to rewrite the passage and squeeze in the missing line. If, as is likely to have been the case, the rewritten passage was transcribed from the same manuscript, this would not produce any "mixture," and no harm would ensue.

The spelling of *HM 128* has been altered throughout, especially by the erasure of the final "e." And there are corrections which are the result of thought, like that referred to above on the mayoralty of Chichester.

HM 128 has one special feature of considerable interest, first noted by Skeat. "Inside the cover," says Skeat, "is written, in a hand of the *fifteenth century*, the remark —'Robert or will*ia*m langland made pers ploughma*n*.'" The binding belongs to the early Tudor period, but it seems hardly possible that it can be of the fifteenth century or that the note can be older than the present Tudor binding. It would probably be safer to describe this note as "not later than the early sixteenth century." The matter has received from Captain Haselden and Mr. Schulz, of the Department of Manuscripts, the careful scrutiny which it needs, and their note is appended below.[1]

I should add that, while writing this report, I have received a letter from Mrs. F. Blackman, whose article on the relationship of the manuscripts of the *B-text* has been of the very greatest value.[2] She has been making a comparison on the basis of eight pages of photostats [3] of *HM 128*, sent her some time ago by the Huntington Library, and her conclusions from this specimen are the same as my own. She writes:

HM 128 belongs to the same group as *W* and *Cr.* It is not the ancestor of either *W* or *Cr.*, nor is it derived from either of these two. It is inferior to *W*, but superior to *Cr.* *W*'s individual errors are generally unimportant (the only serious one in these passages is XIX, 273, *deide any deeth* for *did any dede*). But the individual errors of *HM 128* and of the Crowley reprint are more important, and are often very careless.

[1] See pp. 26–27.

[2] *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XVII, 489–543.

[3] Folios: 146^{v}, 147^{r}, comprising IX, 33–102; 156^{v}, 157^{r}, comprising XI, 423–XII, 67; 198^{v}, 199, 200^{r}, comprising XIX, 246–402.

HM 128 offers, then, a valuable corrective to *W*, but, as a document for fixing the *B-text*, it has not the same primary value as *L* or *W*, or even as *Y* or *O*. It ranks among the subsidiary manuscripts, which can be used for checking these primary manuscripts.

Manuscript *HM 114* belongs to the second, and largest, group of *B*-manuscripts: that is to say, it is akin to *C*, *O*, *B*, *Cot.*, *Bm*, *Y*, and C_2. Thus, in common with these manuscripts, it inserts certain spurious lines [1] which are wanting in the other groups. These lines were admitted by Skeat into his critical text — wrongly, as he subsequently thought. Certain essential lines are omitted, or transposed in *HM 114*.

Everywhere, *HM 114* shows the work of an inaccurate transcriber, who has altered his original with great frequency — sometimes from oversight, sometimes quite deliberately. He substitutes more modern words for archaic ones (such as *takyn* for *ynome*, *ashamyd* for *abasshed*, *rebukyd* for *undernome*).

Further, the manuscript is derived from one which had received a number of interpolations from a *C-text*. One of the most difficult points in fixing the *B-text* is to distinguish exactly how it is differentiated from the *C-text*; and the manuscripts upon which the editor has to rely must be pure *B-texts*, free from suspicion of *C*-interpolation.

For these reasons, the assistance afforded by *HM 114* in the task of fixing a critical text of *B* is likely to be very slight, especially as it belongs to a group of manuscripts which is already well represented by such good examples as *Y* and *O*.

The C-Text

There are twenty-six manuscripts of the *C-text* at present known. The Aberystwyth manuscript (N_2) is imperfect and corrupt, and may be left out of consideration. The remaining twenty-five fall into three classes.

The first class consists of manuscripts *T* (*Trin. Coll.*, *Camb.*, *R. 3. 14*) and H_2 (*Brit. Mus.*, *Harleian*, *6041*). H_2 is a pale reflex of *T*. These manuscripts, however, are only extant for the second half of the

[1] E.g.: V, 273, 303, 338, 569; VI, 49. These manuscripts and *HM 114* omit VI, 315, and transpose V, 443–44. A large number of other examples could be given.

poem, from C. XII, 297, onwards. They are of great value for fixing the text of that second half, but on account of their fragmentary state they could not form the basis of an edition.

The second class consists of thirteen manuscripts, of which the most important is the Huntington Library manuscript *HM 137*. This was formerly in the possession of Richard Heber, of Hodnet, in Shropshire (*No. 973*), and was lent by him to Dr. Whitaker, who printed it in 1813. It was therefore the first manuscript of the *C-text* to be printed, and the first text of *Piers Plowman* to be printed since Tudor times. After the sale of the Heber library, this manuscript passed into the Phillipps collection (*Phillipps 8231*), and it was in this collection when Skeat set to work on his edition of the *C-text* about 1870. From its ownership, Skeat gave this manuscript the distinguishing letter *P*, which it has since retained. And, as it is the outstanding representative of its group of thirteen manuscripts, the whole thirteen are best spoken of as the "p-group." In 1923 *P* passed to the Huntington Library (*HM 137*). It is one of the most beautiful of the *Piers Plowman* manuscripts.

Skeat was very rightly anxious to print, as the basis of his *C-text*, some manuscript other than *P*, because *P* had already been printed. "I considered," he says, "that it would be a distinct gain to have two manuscripts printed in full, instead of one." He accordingly had manuscript *M* completely transcribed. *M* (*Brit. Mus., Cotton, Vespasian, B. XVI*) belonged to the same family as *P*, and Skeat soon discovered it to be inferior to *P*. He then turned to the manuscript which was (and still is) in the possession of the Earl of Ilchester (hence named *I* by Skeat). This was a representative of the other group of ten manuscripts which, we shall see later, is really a better group than the "p-group." The earls of Ilchester have, from Skeat's time till now, always been very generous in putting this manuscript at the disposal of scholars, and Skeat was able to make a detailed collation of it. It is a well written and early manuscript, but has unfortunately at some remote period suffered from damp, and from rats which have eaten away halves of a good many lines; a number of leaves have been lost, and much is illegible. Skeat perceived that it would not serve as the basis of his edition. At the same time he was convinced that it was a very valuable manuscript, and was struck with the way in which

it differed from the other manuscripts of the *C-text* which he had studied, all of which belonged to the "p-group." Unfortunately, the best specimens of the Ilchester type of manuscript had not been discovered in Skeat's time, and he did not experiment any further with members of that group. But he gave, in his edition, a full collation of the Ilchester manuscript. As the Ilchester manuscript (*I*) was for a long time the only one of its type about which students had information, that type has come to be known as the "i-type." The individual imperfections of Ilchester concealed the essential "goodness" of the type to which it belongs.

After some further experimenting with manuscripts of the "p-type," Skeat was driven to the conclusion, from which he had tried to escape, that he must base his text upon the same manuscript as Whitaker had used, *P*, the present *HM 137*. He accordingly did so.

Yet there are, in reality, grave objections to this manuscript as the basis of an edition. It is indeed a beautiful manuscript, written with much care. But, quite apart from the fact that it belongs to what can, I think, be proved to be an inferior group, the "p-group," it has serious individual defects which disqualify it as the basic manuscript of the *C-text*, in spite of the fact that it has occupied that position in the two editions hitherto printed.

Though it is very difficult to say with any exactitude what was the spelling or the dialect of the author or authors of *Piers Plowman*, it is possible to enumerate features which were certainly *not* characteristic of the spelling and dialect of the poem. *HM 137* (*P*) shows, however, throughout, marked peculiarities of spelling (which are rarely to be found in any other manuscript of *Piers Plowman*), such as *wer* for *wher*, *whitterly* for *witterly*, *lornede* for *lernede*, *bethe* for *bothe*. If these spellings were characteristic of the original writer, it would be difficult to account for their absence from the other manuscripts, and their wholesale retention in *P*. They are, on the contrary, to be regarded as peculiarities of the scribe of *P*, or of his archetype. We know the name of the scribe of *P*, Thomas Dankastre, although, at present, we know nothing else about him, except what he has recorded: his thanks to God upon finishing his work, and his love of a drink.

It has been argued above that, when we have such a large supply of manuscripts as we have in the case of the *C-text*, peculiarities of spell-

ing and dialect afford a stronger reason against making a manuscript the basis of a critical text than do real errors of wording, or the omission of necessary words. A phrase miswritten, or a word omitted, by a careless scribe can be corrected from other manuscripts or families of manuscripts. But we know too little about the spelling and dialect of the original *Piers Plowman* to enable us to reconstruct them in the same way that we seek to reconstruct the wording, from a comparison of all the manuscripts. If we began to normalize spelling, we should not know where to stop. The genealogical method, which is helpful in reconstructing the original wording, does not help with this spelling and dialect: for manuscripts, which the wording shows to be derived from one and the same original, have often had a widely different dialect imposed on them by their scribes. Or, to put it in another way, we are dependent, in the matter of dialect and spelling, to a much greater degree than we are in the matter of wording, upon our basic manuscript, and it is therefore all the more vital to select a well spelled manuscript, containing no spelling which we have reason to think the original writer would not have used. The abnormal spelling and dialect forms used by Thomas Dankastre made Skeat's *C-text* look very different from his *B-text*. They accordingly confirmed the impression, which many scholars had formed on other grounds, that the *C-text* must be the work of another writer. It may be that this is so; but the apparent confirmation derived from the spelling is misleading. In point of fact, Dankastre's spellings are just as abnormal, when we compare them with those of most other manuscripts of the *C-text*, as they are when we compare them with the manuscripts of the *B-text*.

Nevertheless, Skeat was not far wrong in ranking *P* as the best example of the manuscripts of the *C-text* which he had examined. The other members of the "p-group" are nearly all disqualified by some defect or other, often more serious than the defects of *P*. Of the manuscripts of the "p-group" of the *C-text* at Oxford, *E* (*Bodleian, Laud, 656*) is very like *P*, but inferior to it, and has dialectal oddities, though of a different kind. *Z* (*Bodley, 851*) does not begin to be a reliable manuscript till Passus X. *K* (*Digby, 171*) has lost its earlier and its later sections. Of the "p-group" manuscripts at Cambridge, *Q* (*Additional 4325*) is perfect, but has unsatisfactory spellings. *S*

(*Corpus Christi Coll., Camb., 293*) has unsatisfactory spellings, and is seriously imperfect. *F* (*Ff. 5. 35*) and *G* (*Dd. 3. 13*) are also seriously imperfect. Of the "p-group" manuscripts in the British Museum, *R* (*Royal, 18. B. XVII*), though good considering its date, is a sixteenth-century manuscript with modernized spelling, and *M* (*Cotton, Vespasian, B. XVI*) has unsatisfactory spelling, and in other ways represents a confused tradition. *N* (*Harleian, 2376*) is given to the "substitution of similars": the scribe has constantly varied his text by altering the phrases he found in his original. *W*, in the possession of the Duke of Westminster, at Eaton Hall, only begins to be a *C-text* halfway through the poem. *V*, the manuscript at Trinity College, Dublin (*D. 4. 1*), might be put forward as a rival to *P*; it is free from the annoying spelling peculiarities which characterize *P*.

But *V*, which is closely allied to *P*, *E*, *R*, and *M*, has the faults which disqualify the whole "p-group." The scribe of the original from which all manuscripts of this group derive was addicted to making small alterations and expansions in the text which he had before him. To detect these we have to turn to the other group, the "i-group." The scribe of the manuscript from which the "i-group" is derived was also addicted to this fault, but not to the same extent. The critical *C-text* has, therefore, to be formed by a comparison of the "p-group" and the "i-group," each group being used so far as possible to eliminate the errors of its rival. But the "i-group" stands nearest to the original.

Skeat was prevented from observing this, because the member of the "i-group" from which he worked (Ilchester) had so many serious additional faults. It was the only member of the "i-group" which he collated, and he could get very little help from the other members of this group which he knew. Manuscripts *O* (*Brit. Mus., Additional 10574*), *L* (*Cotton, Caligula, A. XI*), and *B* (*Bodley, 814*) are all transcripts of one original. That original is, in the main, a *B-text*, but the opening section was missing, and was transcribed from a *C-text* as far as Passus III. These manuscripts are, therefore, of no use to the editor of the *C-text* except for the opening section. In the case of D_2 (*Bodleian, Digby, 145*), the reverse happened — the scribe tacked the latter half of the *C-text* onto his *A-text*. P_2 (*Brit. Mus., Additional 34779*) is a confused and worthless text. *Y* (*Bodleian, Digby, 102*), though good, is imperfect, only beginning in the middle of Passus III.

There remain *D*, *U*, and *X*. *D* (*Bodleian*, *Douce*, *104*), though perfect, is the work of a scribe who has made many plausible alterations in his text. The only really good manuscripts of the "i-group" are the two which have been discovered since Skeat's time, *U* and *X*:

U. *Additional 35157*, in the British Museum;

X. Huntington Library, *HM 143*.

A comparison of these three manuscripts (*D*, *U*, and *X*) throughout Passus III (Skeat's numbering [1]) gave this result, based on the provisional critical *C-text*:

Errors in *HM 143*	49
Errors in *Additional 35157*	71
Errors in *D* (*Bodleian*, *Douce*, *104*)	121

This comparison shows the marked inferiority of *D*. The comparison of *HM 143* and *Additional 35157* was carried on through Passus IV and V (Skeat's numbering), giving for these passus the result:

Errors in *HM 143*	146
Errors in *Additional 35157*	178

Further shorter passages were compared, but always *HM 143* had the smallest number of errors. In this case *P* was compared also.

Passus I, ll. 95–124:	
Errors in *HM 143*	5
Errors in *Additional 35157*	9
Errors in *P* (*HM 137*)	14
Passus II, ll. 107–25:	
Errors in *HM 143*	6
Errors in *Additional 35157*	13
Errors in *P* (*HM 137*)	16
Passus XIII, ll. 201–28:	
Errors in *HM 143*	7
Errors in *Additional 35157*	10
Errors in *P* (*HM 137*)	18

The total number of errors against *HM 143*, for the passus compared, is 213. Its nearest rival, *Additional 35157*, has a total of 281.

[1] The numbering of the passus in the "p-group" of the *C-text* is higher by one than elsewhere, for the Prologue is called Passus I, Passus I is called Passus II, and so on. Skeat

Of course no exact finality can be claimed for these figures. No two men would construct a critical text which would be in all respects the same, and with any change in the critical text there would be consequential changes in these figures. But such changes would probably cancel out, and leave the relative position of the manuscripts unchanged.

I think, therefore, that, when a critical edition of the *C-text* is made, the manuscript which should be used as the base should not be, as it has hitherto been, *HM 137*, but rather *HM 143*. *Additional 35157* comes very near in value to *HM 143*, but its erratic spellings would make it a bad manuscript upon which to base a text. The worst fault of *HM 143* is its habit of omitting words, and these can be supplied from other manuscripts.

It would appear that, from the point of view of the construction of a critical text, *HM 143* is the most important of the Huntington Library manuscripts of *Piers Plowman*, and that it is, indeed, the most important manuscript of the *C-text*. It would be very helpful if a photostat of *HM 143* could be available in the three chief libraries in England where manuscripts of *Piers Plowman* are collected: the Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, and the British Museum. But if *HM 143* is to form the basis of the *C-text*, it is essential to have information of all corrections and erasures. A list of these has been made by Captain Haselden and Mr. Schulz, and copies will be appended to the photostats. When this is done, the first step will have been taken towards the proper editing of the *C-text*. *HM 137* is also a very important manuscript, but it is available in Skeat's reprint (Early English Text Society). This reprint is very accurate.[1]

followed this numbering in his edition of the *C-text*, so that his passus bear different numbers from those of the corresponding passus in the *A-text* and the *B-text*, or in the other groups of the *C-text*. To avoid confusion, I follow Skeat's numbering, above; but it must be noted that this does not agree with the numbering in manuscripts *HM 143* and *Additional 35157*. In any future edition of the *C-text*, Skeat's numbering ought probably to be abandoned.

[1] The few errors are in unimportant matters of spelling; the corrected readings follow:
I, 22 (fol); 111 (hyme); 176 (mest)
II, 37 (þys wrecchede); 93 (ytermenyde); 140 (lornedist, 3owethe); 181 (ma *for* ma*n*)
III, 29 (no *clearly*); 114 (aselede)
IV, 19 (wer); 201 (burgeis *clearly*); 204 (no *clearly*); 341 (lyuenge); 346 (recordantium *clearly*); 412 (suthe); 452 (no)

For the editing of the *B-text*, the Huntington Library manuscripts do not offer the same assistance. An editor might wish, in order to make his collections complete, to append to his text collations of these manuscripts. But there would probably be comparatively few cases where the reading of these manuscripts would affect the reading which he adopted in his critical text.

It is now possible, after the study of the Huntington Library manuscripts of *Piers Plowman*, amid that freedom from the interruptions of academic life which the Huntington Library affords, to form a clear idea of the form which an edition of *Piers Plowman* should take. The *A-text* should be printed on the top of the page, and the *B-* and *C-texts* in parallel columns below, with the collations appended in each case. The *A-text* should be based on manuscript *Trinity Coll., Camb., R. 3. 14*; the *B-text*, probably on *Laud, 581*; and the *C-text*, on *HM 143*.

In dealing with *HM 137* and *HM 143*, the extraordinary apparatus which Captain Haselden has assembled for examining difficult places in manuscripts has been of very special value. I only wish that such apparatus were available in some of the libraries in Europe where manuscripts of *Piers Plowman* are preserved, and I wish to express my thanks to him, and to his staff.

V, 15 (suthe); 82 (no hondes); 120 (bisshepes); 132 (atte þe); 155 (atte þe); 172 (deseruyde)

VI, 4 (londen); 150 (dreuthe); 201 (endeþ)

VII, 48 (Ther); 49 (an craue); 111 (wenne); 124 (wit); 149 (cliped either oþere); 152 (folle); 190 (wommon whit); 193 (an hor); 198 (bytelbrowede); 226 (a podyng-ale); 236 (wenne); 244 (lonede); 245 (lonede); 277 (wenne); 337 (whit good wille); 353 (betene); 354 (wederwarde); 354 (hue wolde); 356 (yshreuen); 372 (repere); 403 (no)

VIII, 97 (wolcomeþ); 149 (mechel); 194 (ony); 224 (stel-nat); 245 (southe); 286 (ne forþer)

IX, 3 (sowed)

The errors are so minute that I did not think it worth while to collate the manuscript beyond Passus IX.

Note on the Inscription in HM 128

There is evidence that the inscription, "Robert or will*iam* langland made pers ploughma*n*", was written in the sixteenth century and not in the fifteenth as heretofore supposed.

The present binding is of brown leather, over oak boards, ornamented with a roll-produced border of medallions and Renaissance ornaments; within the border are conventional center and corner stamps; the back is in five compartments. The date of the binding is probably about 1540. Two brass clasps were attached to the boards by fifteenth-century, thick, red leather hinges after the present binding was completed. Pasted inside the front cover is part of a vellum leaf from a fifteenth-century manuscript. In the lower margin of this leaf two inscriptions concerning the authorship of *Piers Plowman* are written. This and the following flyleaf are sewn onto the bands and have no conjugate leaves. The body of the text then follows: 1. *Prick of Conscience*. 2. *Sequentiae*. 3. *Piers Plowman*, etc. The leaves of the manuscript have been trimmed in rebinding, so that in some cases the headlines have been entirely cut away.

An examination of the manuscript shows that there are two sewings, the present one and an earlier one; therefore, the present binding is not the original.

There are wormholes, in the first few leaves of the text, which do not appear either in the flyleaf or in the leaf of manuscript which bears the inscription; therefore, the flyleaf and the inscription leaf were not a part of the original binding. The flyleaf has some mathematical sums jotted down on it and the name "Richard" written twice in an Elizabethan hand. There is also on the flyleaf an offset from the inscription, which undoubtedly occurred at the time of writing, as it evidently was made before the ink had dried. It in no way resembles an offset caused by damp, which would likewise have caused the Bale inscription directly below it to offset. The fact that the offset occurs on the flyleaf is further evidence that the inscription was written in after the volume was made up and bound the second time. Consequently, the inscription was written some time after the volume was rebound, probably about 1540. There is no objection to this date on palaeographical grounds.

This manuscript, *HM 128*, may perhaps be the same as that which is listed by Bale in his notes,[1] and there described as being "Ex domo Guilhelmi Sparke." Bale quotes the first line of Sparke's manuscript as:

[1] *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, ed. Reginald Lane Poole (Oxford, 1902), p. 509.

"li. i. 'In a somer season whan set was the sunne,' etc."
The first line of *HM 128* runs:

"In a someres seysoun whan set was the sun*n*e".

The reading "set" does not occur in any of the other fifty manuscripts of *Piers Plowman*, though it *is* found in Crowley's reprint. It forms an argument, therefore, for identifying the two manuscripts, especially as *HM 128* must at some time have been in Bale's hands, for he wrote the note about the authorship immediately below the "Robert or will*ia*m" inscription. The first line of Sparke's manuscript as quoted by Bale is not identical, either in wording or spelling, with the first line of *HM 128*. But neither, in *HM 128*, is Bale's transcription of the first line —

"In somer season whan set was su*n*ne" —

the same as the first line of the manuscript which he was quoting, which shows that Bale did not trouble to make an accurate transcription. The agreement on this reading of "set," and the fact that the manuscript was in Bale's hands, render it probable that *HM 128* is Sparke's manuscript. If so, it becomes very possible that William Sparke may have written the "Robert or will*ia*m" inscription when he had the manuscript rebound. Only a comparison of the inscription with an example of Sparke's handwriting could determine this.[1]

R. B. Haselden
H. C. Schulz

[1] For a suggested identification of this William Sparke, see Oscar Cargill, in *PMLA*, L, 45 (Mar., 1935).

The Christian Muse

By LILY B. CAMPBELL

RECENT studies of Milton have spent a good deal of print in incidental reference to Urania, the muse whom he invokes in *Paradise Lost*. She has been explained as the fruit of Milton's rabbinical reading;[1] she has even been seriously considered as throwing light upon the sex life of God.[2]

Inferences so far-fetched and unnecessary result, it seems to me, from the fact that Milton scholars generally have ignored the history of the great movement toward divine poetry which had developed as the answer of Christendom to the Revival of Learning.[3] Beginning late in the fifteenth century, first centering about the court of Marguerite of Navarre, it was a movement conscious and militant in its opposition to the secular and pagan literature which was being reintroduced into western Europe. In England the movement culminated in the works of the great divine poet, Milton. To discuss the question of whether *Paradise Lost* is an epic or a divine poem,[4] however, is to miss the significance of the whole, for divine poetry was opposed to secular poetry, Christian poetry to pagan poetry. Throughout the Christian Renaissance divine poetry had as many genres as secular poetry.

[1] See H. F. Fletcher, *Milton's Semitic Studies* (Chicago, 1926), pp. 115–25, and *idem*, *Milton's Rabbinical Readings* (Urbana, 1930), pp. 87, 109–20, 127, *et passim*. Professor Fletcher uses the older work of A. W. Verity, *Paradise Lost* (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 686–88, by way of ready reference to previous conceptions of Milton's muse.

[2] Denis Saurat, *Milton: Man and Thinker* (New York, 1925), pp. 291–92. Also Maurice Kelley, "'Paradise Lost,' VII, 8–12, and the 'Zohar,'" in *Modern Language Review*, XXIX, 322–24. A recent article by Mr. Kelley gives, it would seem, a different interpretation of Urania. See his "Milton and the Third Person of the Trinity," in *Studies in Philology*, XXXII, 221–34.

[3] Of this the Reverend William Lauder seems to have had a faint inkling, but on the history of his fate at the hands of Milton's defenders see J. W. Good, *Studies in the Milton Tradition* (Urbana, 1915), pp. 185–93. See also Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1932), pp. 244–47.

[4] A brief summary of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century positions on this point is given by Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–60. See Marianna Woodhull, *The Epic of Paradise Lost* (New York, 1907).

I cannot within the space of this paper recount the history of the movement, which I hope to chronicle in a larger work soon; but, in proof of the opposition between secular and divine, pagan and Christian, literature, I offer the comments of a selected few of the many English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who argued the claims of divine literature. My first quotation is from "Myles Coverdale unto the Christian Reader," prefixed to his *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes* in the time of Henry VIII:

> . . . Yea, would God that our minstrels had none other thing to play upon, neither our carters and ploughmen other thing to whistle upon, save psalms, hymns, and such godly songs as David is occupied withal! And if women, sitting at their rocks, or spinning at the wheels, had none other songs to pass their time withal, than such as Moses' sister, Glehana's wife, Debora, and Mary the mother of Christ, have sung before them, they should be better occupied than with *hey nony nony*, *hey troly loly*, and such like phantasies.
>
> . . . therefore, to give our youth of England some occasion to change their foul and corrupt ballads into sweet songs and spiritual hymns of God's honour, and for their own consolation in him, I have here, good reader, set out certain comfortable songs grounded on God's word, and taken some out of the holy scripture, specially out of the Psalms of David, all whom would God that our musicians would learn to make their songs! and if they which are disposed to be merry, would in their mirth follow the counsel of St Paul and St James, and not to pass their time in naughty songs of fleshly love and wantonness, but with singing of psalms, and such songs as edify, and corrupt not men's conversation.
>
> As for the common sort of ballads which now are used in the world, I report me to every good man's conscience, what wicked fruits they bring. Corrupt they not the manners of young persons? Do they not tangle them in the snares of uncleanness? . . . I need not rehearse, what evil ensamples of idleness, corrupt talking, and all such vices as follow the same, are given to young people through such unchristian songs. . . .[1]

[1] *Remains of Bishop Coverdale*, in *Parker Society Publications* (Cambridge, 1846), pp. 537–39. The date of this work, and that of Thomas Becon mentioned below, cannot be definitely determined. Foxe, in the 1563 edition of his *Actes and Monuments* (pp. 572–73), dated their prohibition by Henry VIII as November 6, 1539. Modern scholarship has left the matter uncertain.

In similar fashion Thomas Becon wrote in his work on *David's Harp*:

Would God that all men of honour would nourish such minstrels in their houses, as David is, and that might sing unto them both at dinner and supper, yea, and at all other times, these most sweet and delectable songs of David! so should both they and all their family be disposed to live more virtuously than many be now-a-days, and be provoked to leave their pompous, gallant, wicked, venereal, fleshly, beast-like, and unclean manner of living. Would God also that all fathers and mothers, all masters and mistresses, would bring up their children and servants in the singing of these most godly songs! Again, would God that all schoolmasters and teachers of youth would, instead of Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, &c., teach these verses of David! For so should they not only obtain eloquence, but also divine erudition, godly knowledge, spiritual wisdom, and increase in all kind of virtue, . . .[1]

In 1564 John Day was still printing the metrical version of the Psalms as

Very meete to be vsed of all sortes of people priuatly for their godly solace & comfort, laying aparte al vngodly songes & balades, whych tend only to the nourishyng of vyce and corruptyng of youth.[2]

Among the Heber Collection of Broadsides and Ballads is preserved an interesting popular expression of the same attitude, written by Thomas Brice *Against filthy writing | and such like delighting*:

What meane the rimes that run thus large in euery shop to sell?
With wanton sound, and filthie sense, me thinke it grees not well
We are not Ethnickes we forsoth, at least professe not so
Why range we then to Ethnickes trade? come bak, where wil ye go?
Tel me is Christ, or Cupide Lord? doth God or Venus reigne?
And whose are wee? whom ought wee serue? I aske it, answere plaine
If wanton Venus, then go forth, if Cupide, keep your trade
If God, or Christ, come bak the best, or sure you will be made
Doth God? is he the Lord in deed? and should we him obey?[3]

[1] *The Early Works of Thomas Becon*, in *Parker Society Publications* (Cambridge, 1843), p. 267.

[2] *The first parte of the Psalmes collected into Englishe Meter, by Thomas Sternholde, and others*, . . . Imprinted at London by Iohn Day . . . 1564.

[3] The date is given as 1562 in the *Short-Title Catalogue*.

In 1577 Arthur Golding's translation of Théodore de Bèze's *A Tragedie of Abrahams Sacrifice* included Bèze's preface, which bemoaned the state of poetry in France and wished that it might be turned to the magnifying of God:

> . . . Of a truth it would become them better to sing a song of God, then to counterfet a ballet of Petrarks, & to make amorous dities, worthy to haue the garlande of sonnetts, or to counterfet the furies of the auncient Poets, to blase abroad the glory of this world, or to consecrate this man or that woman to immortalitie, thinges which beare the readers on hande that the authors of them not only are mounted vp to the toppe of their Pernassus, but also are come to the very circle of the Moone. . . .[1]

The usual plea for divine song was supplemented in *The Commonplaces* of Peter Martyr, published in England in 1583, by a definition of divine poetry:

> Besides this we must vnderstand, that betweene Poems diuine and humane, this is the difference; that humane Poems doo set foorth the renoume of kings, princes, feelds, cities, regions, castels, women, marriages, and sometime of brute beasts. But diuine Poems doo onlie sing of God, and celebrate him onelie, and doo set foorth songs and praises of him alone. And that not without cause: for him alone it behooueth the godlie to worship with all their mind, with all their hart, and with all their strength. Wherefore godlie young men must in anie wise be exhorted chéeflie to celebrate GOD in their verses: for it is not to be feared, that in such an argument they shall want matter. . . .[2]

In 1619 George Wither wrote in *A Preparation To the Psalter* a long defense of biblical poetry, asking,

> Why then should the world be so much more delighted in prophane Histories, and their elegancies? seeing these afford farre greater profit, and euery way as pleasing Straines, as the best of them. Can we be delighted to heare a Heathen *Poet* sing a fabulous story of *Hercules*, their great Champion (whose valour neuer benefitted vs) how hee went downe to hell, and by force brought

[1] The copy in the Huntington Library which I have used is a transcript of the printed text included in the Kemble collection of plays.

[2] *The Common Places of the most famous and renowmed Diuine Doctor Peter Martyr, . . . Translated and partlie gathered by Anthonie Marten, . . .* (London, 1583), Pt. 3, p. 309.

thence the Lady *Proserpina*, whom the Prince of that infernall Region had rauished? And can we not take as great pleasure to heare the diuine *Muse* of this heauenly *Poet*, sing in a true Historie, how for the benefit of all men (euen for vs) Christ our farre more victorious Captaine descended into the lowest depths, for the saluation of our soules; and hauing subdued death, and hell, deliuered that faire Ladie the Church from being rauished by the Prince of Darkenesse? Doth it affect vs to heare but the bare relation, how *Orpheus*, the *Thracian Poet*, so preuailed among the vnmerciful Inhabitants of Hell, that by the power of his *Charmes*, he brought his Wife *Euridice* from those vnpleasant shades? And can we sit vnmooued when the thrice excellent of *Poets* repeats vnto vs the very songs themselues, wherewith the inspirer of all excellencie did himselfe rauish heauen, earth, and hell? and in spight of the strongest manacles of sinne, death, and the Diuell, brought his Spouse, our Mother, from the tyranny of Sathan? Or is it possible we should take pleasure to read how *Amphion*, with the Musicke of his Harpe, drew stones and trees together, for the building of *Thebes*? And yet we, more dull then either those stones and trees, sit insensible of the Melodie his *Harpe* makes, who charmed Spirits, and drew together materials for the building of New *Ierusalem*? . . .[1]

In 1624 Francis Quarles was continuing to defend the same point of view when in his *Sions Elegies* he asked:

If the ruines of *Troy*, *Rome*, *Thebes*, or *Carthage* haue been thought a subject, worthy the imployment of more serious Pennes, to entayle the remembrance thereof to Posteritie, how much more worthy the paines of a liuelyer Pen then mine, is this ancient, most true, and neuer enough to be lamented desolation, and captiuitie of *Ierusalem*, *Ierusalem*, the holy Citie of God, *Ierusalem*, the type of the Catholike Church?[2]

When Richard Crashaw's *Steps to the Temple* was published in 1646, "The Preface to the Reader" was written by one who designated himself "the Authors Friend," and who explained:

Here's *Herbert*'s second, but equall, who hath retriv'd Poetry of late, and return'd it to its Primitiue use; Let it bound back to heaven gates, whence it came. Thinke yee, *St. Augustine* would have steyned his graver Learning

[1] *A Preparation To the Psalter*. By George Wither. (London, 1619), pp. 77–78.

[2] From the address "To the Reader" in *Sions Elegies. Wept By Ieremie the Prophet: And Periphras'd by Fra. Qvarles* (London, 1624).

with a booke of Poetry, had he fancied its dearest end to be the vanity of Love-Sonnets, and Epithalamiums? No, no, he thought with this, our Poet, that every foot in a high-borne verse, might helpe to measure the soule into that better world. *Divine Poetry*; I dare hold it, in position against *Suarez* on the subject, to be the Language of the Angels; it is the Quintessence of Phantasie and discourse center'd in Heaven; . . .

It were prophane but to mention here in the Preface those under-headed Poets, Retainers to seven shares and a halfe; Madrigall fellowes, whose onely businesse in verse, is to rime a poore six-penny soule a Subburb sinner into hell; — May such arrogant pretenders to Poetry vanish, with their prodigious issue of tumorous heats, and flashes of their adulterate braines, and for ever after, may this our Poet fill up the better roome of man. Oh! when the generall arraignment of Poets shall be, to give an accompt of their higher soules, with what a triumphant brow shall our divine Poet sit above, and looke downe upon poore *Homer*, *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Claudian*? &c. who had amongst them the ill lucke to talke out a great part of their gallant Genius, upon Bees, Dung, froggs, and Gnats, &c. and not as himselfe here, upon Scriptures, divine Graces, Martyrs and Angels.[1]

Perhaps I have quoted enough to show that, when Milton discussed his literary autobiography in *The Reason of Church-government Urg'd against Prelaty*, he was presenting the traditional argument for divine as opposed to secular song, of Christian as opposed to pagan story:

. . . the Scripture also affords us a divine pastoral Drama in the Song of *Salomon* consisting of two persons and a double *Chorus*, as *Origen* rightly judges. And the Apocalyps of Saint *Iohn* is the majestick image of a high and stately Tragedy, shutting up and intermingling her solemn Scenes and Acts with a sevenfold *Chorus* of halleluja's and harping symphonies: . . . Or if occasion shall lead to imitat those magnifick Odes and Hymns wherein *Pindarus* and *Callimachus* are in most things worthy, some others in their frame judicious, in their matter most an end faulty: But those frequent songs throughout the law and prophets beyond all these, not in their divine argument alone, but in the very critical art of composition may be easily made appear over all the kinds of Lyrick poesy, to be incomparable. These abilities, wheresoever they be found, are the inspired guift of God rarely be-

[1] *The Poems of Richard Crashaw*, ed. L. C. Martin (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 75–76.

stow'd, but yet to some (though most abuse) in every Nation: and are of power beside the office of a pulpit, to inbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of vertu, and publick civility, to allay the perturbations of the mind, and set the affections in right tune, to celebrate in glorious and lofty Hymns the throne and equipage of Gods Almightinesse, and what he works, and what he suffers to be wrought with high providence in his Church, to sing the victorious agonies of Martyrs and Saints, the deeds and triumphs of just and pious Nations doing valiantly through faith against the enemies of Christ, to deplore the general relapses of Kingdoms and States from justice and Gods true worship. Lastly, whatsoever in religion is holy and sublime, in vertu amiable, or grave, whatsoever hath passion or admiration in all the changes of that which is call'd fortune from without, or the wily suttleties and refluxes of mans thoughts from within, all these things with a solid and treatable smoothnesse to paint out and describe. Teaching over the whole book of sanctity and vertu through all the instances of example with such delight to those especially of soft and delicious temper who will not so much as look upon Truth herselfe, unlesse they see her elegantly drest, . . . And what a benefit this would be to our youth and gentry, may be soon guest by what we know of the corruption and bane which they suck in dayly from the writings and interludes of libidinous and ignorant Poetasters, who having scars ever heard of that which is the main consistence of a true poem, the choys of such persons as they ought to introduce, and what is morall and decent to each one, doe for the most part lap up vitious principles in sweet pils to be swallow'd down, and make the tast of vertuous documents harsh and sowr. . . .[1]

It is, therefore, not without significance that Milton, in picturing the Temptation of Christ, represents Satan as urging upon Christ a knowledge of the classics, while Christ replies:

> Alas what can they teach, and not mislead;
> Ignorant of themselves, of God much more,
> And how the world began, and how man fell
> Degraded by himself, on grace depending?
> Much of the Soul they talk, but all awrie,
> And in themselves seek vertue, and to themselves
> All glory arrogate, to God give none,
> Rather accuse him under usual names,
> Fortune and Fate, as one regardless quite
> Of mortal things. Who therefore seeks in these

[1] *The Reason of Church-government* . . . (London, 1641), pp. 38–40.

True wisdom, finds her not, or by delusion
Far worse, her false resemblance only meets,
An empty cloud.
.
Or if I would delight my private hours
With Music or with Poem, where so soon
As in our native Language can I find
That solace? All our Law and Story strew'd
With Hymns, our Psalms with artful terms inscrib'd,
Our Hebrew Songs and Harps in *Babylon*,
That pleas'd so well our Victors ear, declare
That rather *Greece* from us these Arts deriv'd;
Ill imitated, while they loudest sing
The vices of thir Deities, and thir own
In Fable, Hymn, or Song, so personating
Thir Gods ridiculous, and themselves past shame.
Remove their swelling Epithetes thick laid
As varnish on a Harlots cheek, the rest,
Thin sown with aught of profit or delight,
Will far be found unworthy to compare
With *Sion*'s songs, to all true tasts excelling,
Where God is prais'd aright, and Godlike men,
The Holiest of Holies, and his Saints;
Such are from God inspir'd, not such from thee;
Unless where moral vertue is express't
By light of Nature not in all quite lost.
Thir Orators thou then extoll'st, as those
The top of Eloquence, Statists indeed,
And lovers of thir Country, as may seem;
But herein to our Prophets far beneath,
As men divinely taught, and better teaching
The solid rules of Civil Government
In thir majestic unaffected stile
Than all the Oratory of *Greece* and *Rome*.
In them is plainest taught, and easiest learnt,
What makes a Nation happy, and keeps it so,
What ruins Kingdoms, and lays Cities flat;
These only with our Law best form a King.[1]

The age-old belief in the Scriptures as the Word of God and in the writers of the Scriptures as penmen of the Holy Ghost inevitably led

[1] *Paradise Regain'd*, Bk. IV, ll. 309–21, 331–64. I have used throughout this paper the Oxford University Press edition of *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (London, 1930).

those who sought for aid in composing divine poetry to turn prayerfully to the Spirit that had inspired Moses and David.[1] However, at the very moment when the hosts of Christendom were capturing the classical epic and turning it to new divine uses, there appeared on the scene a Christian muse — one to whom the formal invocation of the Christian epic might appropriately be addressed. The muse was Urania, and she was introduced to the world of divine poetry in a work entitled *La Muse Chrétienne* and published in 1574.[2] The author was Saluste du Bartas, and his book, epochal in Christian poetry, contained two poems of great importance. One was *La Judith*, a divine epic; the other was *L'Uranie*, a poetical plea for and a defense of divine poetry.

[1] One of the most complete invocations is that of Gawin Douglas in his translation of *The .xiii. Bukes of Eneados of the famose Poete Virgill* (London, 1553), fol. vii, verso:

"Thow Prince of Poetis, I the mercy cry
I mene, thou King of Kinges, Lord eterne
Thow be my muse, my gidare, and laid sterne
Remitting my trespas, and euery mys
Throu christ thy sone, bring vs to hewynly blys
Afald godhede ay, lesting but discrepance
In personis thre, equale of ane substance
On the I cal, with humyl hart and milde
Caliope, nor payne, goddis wilde
May do to me no thing, bot harme I wene
In christ I trest, borne of the virgine Quene
Thou Saluiour of mankind, be mye muse
That neuer 3it, na sinful list refuse
Quhilk the besocht, deuotelie for supple
Albeit my sang, to thy hie maiestie
Accordis not, 3it condiscend to my write
For thy excelland mercy, and loue perfite
Thou holy gost, confort and sanctifye
My spret to ende, this wark to thy glory . . ."

[2] I have not been able to verify the facts concerning this edition, which I accept here on the authority of H. Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre* (Paris, 1908). Dr. Ashton (p. 349) gives the place of publication as Bordeaux and notes the dedication, "A Madame Marguerite de France Roine de Navarre." Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* (New York, 1910), p. 334, gives the date as 1573. A. H. Upham, *The French Influence in English Literature* (New York, 1908), dates *L'Uranie* as of 1573. G. Pellisier, *La Vie et les œuvres de Du Bartas* (Paris, 1882), says *L'Uranie* and *La Judith* were published in 1574 (p. 27), gives 1573 as the date of *La Judith* (p. 62) and 1579 as the date of *La Muse Chrétienne* (p. 37, n.), and in a footnote (p. 37) says, "La *Muse chrétienne* est le titre d'un recueil qui renferme les premiers poemes de du Bartas." The catalogues of the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale are unenlightening.

The history of the writing of *La Judith* was told by the author in his preface, and I quote from the English translation of Thomas Hudson, published in 1584 at Edinburgh:

Beloued *Reader*, it is about fourtene years past since I was commanded by the late Illustrate and most vertuous Princesse *Iean*, *Queene of Nauarre*, to reduce the *Historie of Iudith*, in forme of a *Poeme Epique*, wherein I haue not so much aimed to follow the phrase or text of the byble, as I haue preased (without wandering from the veritie of the Historie) to imitate *Homer* in his *Iliades*, and *Virgill* in his *Æneidos*, and others who hath left to vs workes of such like matter: thereby to render my worke so much the more delectable. And if the effect hath not answered to my desire, I beesech thee to laye the fault vppon her who proposed to me so meane a *Theame* or subiect, and not on mee who could not honestly disobeye. Yet in so much as I am the first in *Fraunce*, who in a iust *Poeme* hath treated in our toung of sacred things, I hope of thy fauour to receiue some excuse, seing that things of so great weight cannot be both perfectly begunne and ended together. . . .[1]

Du Bartas thus announced that it was by the command of Jean, the daughter of Marguerite of Navarre, that he undertook to put the biblical story of Judith into the classical form of the epic, and he claimed, as Milton was to claim in later years, that in so doing he was undertaking "Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime," [2] since he was the first in France "who in a iust *Poeme* hath treated in our toung of sacred things."

The new French apostle of divine poetry was introduced into English letters by no less a person than King James of Scotland, who ordered Thomas Hudson to translate *La Judith* into English, as Hudson informs us in his dedication to King James:

AS your Maiestie Sir, after your accustomed & verteous maner was sometyme discoursing at Table with such your Domestiques, as chaunced to bee attendant.

It pleased your Highnesse (not onely to esteeme the pereles stile of the

[1] *The Historie of Iudith in Forme of a Poeme, Penned in French, by the noble Robt. G. Saluste, Lord of Bartas. Englished by Tho. Hudson* (1584). The reference to the date of composition is not in the later French editions of the poem which I have consulted, but according to Pellisier (*op. cit.*, p. 37) the information was given in the preface to *Judith* included in *La Muse Chrétienne*. This must, then, have been the volume used by Hudson.

[2] *Paradise Lost*, I, i, 16.

Greke HOMER, and the Latin VIRGIL to be inimitable to vs, whose toung is barbarous and corrupted:) But also to alledge partly throw delite your Maiest. tooke in the Hautie stile of those most famous Writers, and partly to sounde the opinion of others, that also the loftie Phrase, the graue inditement, the facound termes of the French Salust (for the like resemblaunce) could not be followed, nor sufficiently expressed in our rude and impollished english language. Wherein, I more boldly then aduisedly (with your Maiest. lycence) declared my simple opinion. . . . But rashly I alledged that it was nothing impossible euen to followe the footsteppes of the same great Poet SALVST, and to translate his vearse . . . succinctlie, and sensibly in our owne vulgar speech. Whereupon, it pleased your Maiestie (among the rest of his workes) to assigne me, *The Historie of Judith*, as an agreable Subiect to your highnesse, to be turned by me into English verse: . . .[1]

The poem which gave *La Muse Chrétienne* its title was the poem *L'Uranie*, a poem which elevated the muse of astronomy into the place she held henceforth as the muse of Christian poetry. More flattering than the royal command which elicited the English translation of *Judith*, was James's personal introduction of the new muse into English literature by including both the French original and his own translation of *Urania* in *The Essayes of a Prentise*, which was published, as was Hudson's *Judith*, in 1584 at Edinburgh by Thomas Vautroullier.

In an address "To the fauorable Reader," James in typical Jacobean English explained his evangelical purpose:

Hauing oft reuolued, and red ouer . . . the booke and Poems of the deuine and Illuster Poëte, *Salust du Bartas*, I was moued by the oft reading & perusing of them, with a restles and lofty desire, to preas to attaine to the like vertue. But sen (alas) God, by nature hathe refused me the like lofty and

[1] Andrew Maunsell, dedicating to Queen Elizabeth in 1595 his work, *The First Part of the Catalogue of English printed Bookes*, gave typical expression to the prevalent concept of the value of translations:

". . . VVhen as the Lord by miracle sent his holy spirite vpon his Apostles at Ierusalem, he sent thē withall (for the propagation of his Gospell) the gift of Tongs, that the strangers there gathered together, heard euery man in his own tongue, the wonderful works of God. So now by ordinarie meanes for the furtheraunce of the same, hath hee giuen not onely his holy spirit to your sacred Maiestie, and godly subiects, but also the gift of Tongues. Whereby it is come to passe (through the blessing of God, and your most godly and peaceable gouernment) that whatsoeuer excellent knowledge of God, or godlynesse is in anie language, we haue it in some measure in our owne."

quick ingyne, and that my dull *Muse*, age, and Fortune, had refused me the lyke skill and learning, I was constrained to haue refuge to the secound, which was, to doe what lay in me, to set forth his praise, sen I could not merite the lyke my self. Which I thought, I could not do so well, as by publishing some worke of his, to this yle of *Brittain* (swarming full of quick ingynes,) aswell as they ar made manifest already to France . . . preferring foolehardines and a good intention, to an vtter dispaire and sleuth, I resolued vnaduysedly to assay the translating in my language of the easiest and shortest of all his difficile, and prolixed Poems: to wit, the *Vranie* or heauenlye Muse, which, albeit it be not Well translated, yet hope I, ye will excuse me . . . sen I neither ordained it, nor auowes it for a iust translation: but onely set it forth, to the end, that, . . . some quick sprited man of this yle, borne vnder the same, or as happie a Planet, as *Du Bartas* was, might by the reading of it, bee moued to translate it well, and best, where I haue bothe euill, and worst broyled it. . . .

L'Uranie enunciated for the first time the whole creed of divine poetry. And when James made a translation of the poem and published the original with his translation in his first poetical offering, he announced himself as the future patron of divine poetry in Britain, and thenceforth he was so considered.

Using James's text as a basis, I have outlined the poem as a means of presenting its subject matter:

(1) The author recounts his early use of poetry to gain gold and honor, he relates his early beginnings with wanton song in honor of Cupid, he tells of his ambition to dress the Greek scene in French — to put on the French stage the deeds of the tyrants of Thebes, Mycenae, and Ilion.

(2) He writes of Urania's appearing to him. He describes her nine-voiced mouth, her sevenfold crown, and her azure gown, the hem of which was adorned with the constellations.

> Her porte was Angellike with Angels face,
> With comely shape and toung of heauenly grace: . . .

(3) He rehearses Urania's speech:

She announces her identity:

> I am said she, that learned VRANIE,
> That to the Starres transports humanitie, . . .

She pleads with him:

O *Salust*, Gods immortals honour sing:
And bending higher *Dauids* Lute in tone,
With courage seke you endles crowne abone.

She bewails the uses to which Frenchmen have brought her sister muses:

But specially but sobbes I neuer shall
Se verse bestowde gainst him made verses all,
I can not see his proper soldiers ding
With his owne armes him that of all is King.

Thus she is led to enunciate the theory of the divine inspiration of the poet:

All art is learned by art, this art alone
It is a heauenly gift: no flesh nor bone
Can preif the honnie we from *Pinde* distill,
Except with holy fyre his breest we fill.
From that spring flowes, that men of speciall chose,
Consumde in learning, and perfyte in prose,
For to make verse in vane dois trauell take,
When as a prentise fairer works will make.

She instances Homer, Ovid, and David in proof, and explains further:

For euen as humane fury maks the man,
Les then the man: So heauenly fury can
Make man pas man, and wander in holy mist,
Vpon the fyrie heauen to walk at list.
Within that place the heauenly Poëts sought
Their learning, syne to vs heare downe it brought,
With verse that ought to *Atropos* no dewe,
Dame *Naturs* trunchmen, heauens interprets trewe.
For Poets right are lyke the pype alway,
Who full doth sound, and empty stayes to play:
Euen so their fury lasting, lasts their tone,
Their fury ceast, their Muse doth stay assone.

She again pleads with him to turn to divine poetry:

Sen verse did then in heauen first bud and blume,
If ye be heauenly, how dar ye presume
A verse prophane, and mocking for to sing

Gainst him that leads of starrie heauens the ring?
Will ye then so ingrately make your pen,
A slaue to sinne, and serue but fleshly men?
Shall still your brains be busied then to fill
With dreames, ô dreamers, euery booke and bill?
Shall Satan still be God for your behoue?
Still will ye riue the aire with cryes of loue?
And shall there neuer into your works appeare,
The praise of God, resounding loud and cleare?

She emphasizes the power of verse to imprint good and evil so strongly in us that Plato would not have poets in his commonwealth. She insists that, because of their shameless rhymes, the poets are looked down upon and poems are forbidden by fathers to their sons.

She insists that poets would be revered instead of disdained if they would sing of holy things, citing David, Moses, Judith, Deborah, Job, and Jeremiah in proof.

She explains that Satan, "who can seame | An Angell of light," stirred up his gods and priests to emulate the song of the blessed.

She calls attention to the horn of plenty, the rich storehouse, the boundless ocean, the deep spring of heavenly subjects that await the singer.

She proclaims the power of high subjects to create high poetry and of immortal subjects to give immortality to verse:

From subiects base, a base discours dois spring,
A lofty subiect of it selfe doeth bring
Graue words and weghtie, of it selfe diuine,
And makes the authors holy honour shine.
.
Let not your art so rare then be defylde,
In singing *Venus* and her fethred chylde:
For better it is without renowme to be,
Then be renowmde for vyle iniquitie.

She begs the poet to consecrate his song to singing the miracles of Scripture, to prefer the Holy Ghost to Pegasus.

She again bewails the state of poetry, and urges Salust to heed her pleas, promising him fame if he will do so.

(4) The poet tells how he was moved by this speech of Urania, so that he afterwards thought himself blessed if he might but touch the crown she bore in her hand, though he might not hope to wear it.

This poem of Du Bartas was published in London, in a French and Latin edition by Thomas Ashley, in 1589. In 1605 it was published, in a new translation by Joshua Sylvester, in his edition of the *Divine Weeks and Works* of Du Bartas, and afterwards took its regular place in all editions of its author's works, as Sylvester wrote autobiographically of

> *Vrania* (noblest of the learned *Nine*)
> Comming from Heau'n to call my Muse from Earth,
> From *Loues*, *loose Sonnets*, *& lasciuious Mirth*;
> In sacred *Weekes* to sing the Workes Diuine: . . .[1]

From Hesiod to Natalis Comes, Urania had received her meed of praise as the muse of astronomy, as the muse of the heavens. Dante, in his *Divine Comedy*, had invoked Urania as the muse of things celestial:[2]

O Virgins sacrosanct, if ever hunger, cold, or vigils I have endured for you, the occasion spurs me that I claim reward therefor. Now it behoves that Helicon pour forth for me, and Urania aid me with her choir to put in verse things difficult to think.[3]

In the early sixteenth century Giovanni Pontano had given the title *Urania* to his great work in Latin hexameters on the heavens, to which he appended a series of Christian poems or hymns.[4] This work had been repeatedly published during the sixteenth century, and probably gave to Du Bartas the title for his plea for Christian poetry.

[1] In the dedicatory sonnet prefixed by Sylvester to his translation of the *Urania* and addressed "To Vertues Patterne, and Beauties Paragon, Mistris *Ione Essex*."

[2] The tradition of divine poetry as associated with Urania may be inferred from the fable of the locusts in Plato's *Phaedrus*, where Calliope and Urania are described as "these Muses who are most concerned with heaven and with thought divine and human and whose music is the sweetest." (Loeb Classical Library ed. [1926], pp. 510–13.) The note on this passage of Dante by Francesco Sansovino, *Dante* (1564), p. 259, is interesting in this connection.

[3] From the translation of *The Divine Comedy* by Charles Eliot Norton (Cambridge, 1892), II, 184.

[4] Cf. Ben. Soldati, *La poesia astrologica nel quattrocento* (1906), and that author's edition of Pontano's *Carmina* (1902). The latter I have not seen.

It was in the poem of Du Bartas, however, that Urania entered the scene as the muse of Christian poetry. Even the invocation of the Heavenly Muse, which appeared in later editions of the great Tasso's *La Gerusalemme Liberata*, is not to be found in the early versions that preceded his trip to Paris in 1571, where it is probable he came under the influence of Du Bartas. This invocation I quote from the 1600 English translation by Edward Fairfax:[1]

> *O heauenly muse*, that not with fading baies
> Deckest thy brow by th'Heliconian spring,
> But sittest *crownd with stars immortall raies*
> In heauen, where legions of bright Angels sing,
> Inspire life in my wit, my thoughts vpraise,
> My verse ennoble, and forgiue the thing,
> If fictions light I mixe with truth diuine,
> And fill these lines with others praise than thine.
>
> Thither thou know'st the world is best inclinde
> Where luring Parnase most his sweete imparts,
> And truth conuay'd in verse of gentle kinde,
> To reade perhaps will mooue the dullest harts:
> So we (if children yong diseas'd we finde)
> Annoint with sweets the vessels formost parts,
> To make them taste the potions sharpe we giue;
> They drinke deceiu'd; and so deceiu'd, they liue.

It must be emphasized that, when Urania became the muse of Christian poetry, she became the center of a whole doctrine and defense of Christian poetry which had been gradually growing up in Christian Europe and in England. The apologia in the poem of Du Bartas gave unity to the movement's tenets, many of which are

[1] *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The Recoverie of Ierusalem. Done into English Heroicall verse, by Edward Fairefaix, Gent.* (London, 1600), stanzas 2 and 3. The italics are mine. That this address to the Heavenly Muse was inserted some time after Tasso's visit to Paris, seems certain from the facts to be found in A. Solerti's critical edition of *Gerusalemme Liberata* (Florence), I (1896), 109, 259; II (1895), 3, 35 (and n.). For the probable influence of Du Bartas on Tasso, see Solerti's edition of the *Poemi Minori* (Bologna, 1891), II, xvii–lvii. The invocation was first published in England in *Torqvati Tassi Solymeidos, Liber Primvs Latinis Nvmeris Expressvs, à S. Gentili* (London, 1584). The misunderstanding of the Heavenly Muse has led Miss Helen M. Briggs ("Tasso's Theory of Epic Poetry," *Modern Language Review*, XXV, 469) to a curious rationalizing of the subject.

but Christianized interpretations of precepts familiar as classical heritages:

(1) There was a renewed appeal to elevate poetry, to reclaim it from the base uses to which it had been put.
(2) There was an insistence upon the divine inspiration of the poet, upon the fact that he could write only when the furious fit was on, upon the belief that the poet's art is a heavenly gift.
(3) There was reinterpreted the old principle that the high subject brought with it the high style in its treatment.
(4) There was stressed the fact that the divine poets used a great variety of meters.
(5) There was begun a curious balancing of pagan and Christian mythology: Pegasus versus the dove, Deucalion's flood versus Noah's, etc.
(6) There was an insistence upon the better material for poetry to be found in the histories of faith's effects than in the ancient classical stories.
(7) There was an insistence upon the necessity for the poet's mixing profit with pleasure.
(8) There was held out the hope of fame eternal, which could come only to the poet who wrote of eternal things.

It can fairly be said, I think, that this is the basic creed of the Christian Renaissance. The appropriation of the muse and the enunciation of the creed were the significant work of Du Bartas in *L'Uranie*.[1]

In May of 1587, Du Bartas himself came by way of England to Scotland, apparently in answer to the enthusiastic invitation of King James, which I quote as showing the interrelation of James and Du Bartas and Urania:

Alexandre le grand ayant esté informé de la grande uertu & sagesse de Diogenes philosophe cinique en fut tellement rauy qu'il ne se sceut contenter iusques tant qu'il eut communiqque auec lui, estimant d'aquerir non la moindre partie de contentement & renommée in se faisant *oculatus testis* des singulieres uertus de ce susdit personnage. La pareille occasion de rauisse-

[1] In 1800 Charles Dunster, in his *Considerations on Milton's Early Reading*, affirmed his belief that Sylvester's Du Bartas had taught Milton that "Sacred Poetry was capable of assuming the most elevated *tone*" and had led him to see that Urania united the qualities of both Clio and Calliope. He published as an appendix a translation of *Urania* and recognized it as treating of sacred poetry. No one seems to have followed up the suggestion offered by Dunster. In March of this year (1935) the late Professor Lotspeich (*Modern Language Notes*,

ment, ô tres illustre poete, m'estant ministrée par la lecture de mon Homere (car de mesme facon ie me sers des menus-fruicts de nostre admirable muse comme ce susdit conquereur des Iliades) que iay esté agité de deux fortes passions dun mesme instant, á scauoir, iuste Douleur & insatiable Desir: Douleur que ce pais n'a esté si heureusement fertile que d'auoir produit un tell' colosse ou piramide triomfale triomfant urayement sur le monde d'un triomfe eternell, pour auoir le premier mis en oeuure, & le seul puisé profondement iusques au fonds ce diuin subiect, chantant poetiquement la creation & conseruation aussi bien du grand monde que du microcosme par la sage puissance & soigneuse prouidence du tout puissant Createur, mais quant á l'extresme Desir, il me pousse sans cesse á l'imitation de ce Douleur du monde que comme iournellement i'oy le chant de l'Uranie ie puisse une fois obtenir la ueue de son fidelle secretaire. N'estimes, ô Saluste, qu'en usant ces epithetes enuers uous ie me ueuille seruir de la faulse flatterie ains du deu & uray louange de la uertu, le hault louange de laquelle ne doyt estre passée en silence habitante en personne quelquonque: & comme chacuns desireux de uoir le pourtraict de ceux qui ont surpasse le monde en quelque insigne uertu, d'autant, qu'ill le remett en memoire des uertus si louables de mesme, ayie un ardant desir de ueoir le palais de la Muse urayement celeste, puis que null mortell ne peut ueoir l'host, pour ceste cause ie uous escrips ceste present. Ie uous prie donques tres affectueusement de prendre tant de peine que de uenir icy au commencement de l'esté prochain, & mesme en may, sil est possible; le uoyage n'est point long, uous pouues passer par terre, demeurer icy aussi peu de temps que uous uoudres, nonobstant les troubles, ie m'asseure que le roy de Nauar le trouuerra bon pour si peu de temps car ie luy ay aussi escriput pour ce mesme effect, & ie m'asseure que uous uiendres le plus uolontiers puis que nous auons *communes deos*: puis donques que iay tant uoeu uostre ombre en uos oeuures une fois *da dextrae iungere dextram* ie uous prie de rechef de uenir, m'asseurant donques que puis que ma demande est si iuste *ex oratore exorator fieri* ie uous commets & uos estudes à la sainte tuition & inspiration du bon & uray dieu.[1]

L, 141–46), without reference to Dunster, suggested a tentative relationship of the Urania of Spenser and of Milton to that of Du Bartas, though disclaiming any idea of a "definite influence" of Du Bartas upon the later poets. He concluded: "It does not seem improbable that Milton . . . was helped in his Christianizing of a pagan myth by what he found in the two earlier poets."

[1] Professor R. S. Rait, *Lvsvs Regivs: Being Poems and Other Pieces by King Iames Y^e First* (London, 1901), first printed this letter (pp. 60–61), and in the introduction (pp. 58–59) gave an account of the James-Du Bartas friendship. Sidney Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 341–42, quotes the letter in a footnote and repeats much of the information recorded by Professor Rait. On the whole matter of Du Bartas' travels and his services to Navarre, see Ashton, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–30.

In spite of the presumptions of the letter, it would seem that, when Du Bartas arrived in Edinburgh, he did not come solely as the emissary of the Holy Ghost, for according to Sir James Melvill he came also as the agent of the King of Navarre. Melvill states that Mr. Peter Yong and Colonel Stuart had just returned from their sally into Denmark to look over a prospective bride for the King. They reported themselves as pleased with the Danish princess, and the King sent off another embassage:

> These Ambassadours were not well imbarked, when Monsieur *Dubartus* arrived here to visit the King's Majesty, who, he heard, had him in great esteem, for his rare Poesie set out in the *French* Tongue. He would not say that he had a secret Commission to propose the Princess of *Navarre* as a fit marriage for His Majesty, but that the King of *Navarre*'s Secretary willed him, seeing he was to come this way, as on his own head, to propose the said marriage. Monsieur *Dubartus*'s Qualities were so good, and his Credit so great with his Majesty, that it appeared if the Ambassadours had not already made Sail, that their Voyage should have been stayed for that Season. . . .
>
> In the mean time that they were in *Denmark*, Monsieur *Dubartus* being in *Falkland* with His Majesty, came to my house, to perswade me to take a Commission in hand, which he said His Majesty would lay to my charge, which was to be sent unto the King of *Navarre*, and to be acquainted with Madam the Princess, his Sister. And because His Majesty knew that I would be loath to go, he named also my Lord *Tungland*, my Brother, who undertook the journey, and became well acquainted with the said Princess, and was well treated and rewarded by the King her Brother, now King of *France*, and brought with him the Picture of the Princess, with a good report of her rare qualities.[1]

Melvill gives the further story of the negotiations concerning both the Danish and the Navarre marriages, including a most amusing description of James's finally having taken the pictures of the rival princesses into retirement with him for a period of fifteen days to seek the counsel of God in the matter. He emerged thinking that God had advised in favor of Denmark. But time had passed, and Du Bartas had gone home long since. He had not departed, however, without

[1] *The Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Hal-Hill: . . . Now published from the Original Manuscript. By George Scott. Gent.* (London, 1683), pp. 176–77.

entertainment provided by James in characteristic fashion, the special treat having been a disputation at St. Andrews between the acrimonious Andrew Melvill and the Bishop.[1]

In 1591 *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises* was published in Edinburgh. The first section included James's translation of "The Exord, or Preface of the Second Week of Du Bartas," "The Translators Invocation," and a translation of *The Furies* of Du Bartas. The second section (with a separate title-page) was (except for a solitary sonnet) given over to James's own poem *The Lepanto*, in which he seems to have set out to write another *Jerusalem Delivered*. The third section (again with a separate title-page) consisted of a French translation by Du Bartas of James's poem *The Lepanto* and a flattering poem by the translator to the author. Each section contained an address by the author to the reader. In the first James praises Du Bartas, in the last Du Bartas praises James. The whole constitutes a most admirable record of literary reciprocity.

The continued admiration of James for Du Bartas is attested by his literary tributes to the poet, but perhaps even more by the way in which he became the recognized recipient of what may, I suppose, be called "Bartasiana"— translations of Du Bartas and offerings of divine poetry in general. There can be little doubt in the mind of anyone who reads the ponderous utterances of James, that he rather fancied himself in his role of successor to both David and Solomon as Christian King and penman to the Holy Ghost.

It was inevitable, however, that Du Bartas should become a much-translated poet even without the royal patronage of James, and his *Divine Weekes and Works* was accordingly Englished (and Latinized also, to make immortality certain) day by day and section by section. The first of the English translators was with a certain inevitability Sir Philip Sidney. Sidney's friendship with the writers of the court of Navarre is well known. Whether he undertook the translation of *The First Day of the First Week* of Du Bartas' account of the creation because of a personal friendship with the poet, because of his interest in the affairs of the court of Navarre, or because he wished to continue

[1] For another account of this visit, see *The Autobiography and Diary of Mr James Melvill, . . . With a Continuation of the Diary*, ed. for The Wodrow Society (Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 255–57.

the undertaking as advocated by King James, it is impossible to tell. Du Bartas in his survey of the literary men of the world singled out four English writers for special commendation: Sir Thomas More, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Sir Philip Sidney, and Queen Elizabeth. But Sidney's political and literary relationships would in any case have made him the most likely translator for this most Christian poet.[1]

On August 23, 1588, therefore, there was entered on the *Stationers' Registers* to William Ponsonby:

> Receaued of him for a booke of Sir PHILIP SIDNEYS makinge intitled *Arcadia:* aucthorised vnder the Archbishop of CANTERBURY [his] hand vj^{d}
>
> *Item* Receaued of him for A translation of *SALUST DE BARTAS.* Done by ye same Sir P. in the Englishe vj^{d}

Sidney's interest in Du Bartas seems to have been deeper than is implied merely by this single undertaking. Indeed, a rereading of his *Apologie for Poetrie* in comparison with Du Bartas' *L'Uranie* makes it clear that, in the greater and more comprehensive work, he was using many of the arguments of *L'Uranie* concerning divine poetry, giving to England the message Du Bartas had given to France. Thus, in discussing the dearth of good English lyric poetry, Sidney says:

> Other sorts of Poetry haue we none, but that Lyricall kind of Songs and Sonnets: which, Lord, if he gaue vs so good mindes, how well it might be imployed, and with howe heauenly fruite, both priuate and publique, in singing the prayses of the immortall beauty, the immortall goodnes of that God who gyueth vs hands to write and wits to conceiue; of which we might well want words, but neuer matter; of which we could turne our eies to nothing, but we should euer haue new budding occasions.[2]

Again, as he comes to define poesy, he lists three several kinds of poets:

[1] A. W. Osborn, *Sir Philip Sidney en France* (Paris, 1932). It should be remembered, too, that in 1586 Leicester was offering King James the rule of the Netherlands, and Sidney was in communication with the Master of Gray during this time. *Letters and Papers Relating to Patrick Master of Gray* (Edinburgh, 1835), pp. 83, 115. See also A. F. Westcott, *New Poems by James I of England* (New York, 1911), pp. lv, lvii, lxxix–lxxx, 29, 88–89, 92, 98. Concerning a letter in which Du Bartas refers to "Cydné," see Ashton, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–26.

[2] *Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. J. Churton Collins (Oxford, 1907), p. 56.

The chiefe both in antiquitie and excellencie were they that did imitate the inconceiuable excellencies of GOD. Such were *Dauid* in his Psalmes, *Solomon* in his song of Songs, in his Ecclesiastes, and Prouerbs, *Moses* and *Deborah* in theyr Hymnes, and the writer of *Iob*, which, beside other, the learned *Emanuell Tremellius* and *Franciscus Iunius* doe entitle the poeticall part of the Scripture. Against these none will speake that hath the holie Ghost in due holy reuerence. In this kinde, though in a full wrong diuinitie, were *Orpheus*, *Amphion*, *Homer* in his hymnes, and many other, both Greekes and Romaines, and this Poesie must be vsed by whosoeuer will follow S. *Iames* his counsell in singing Psalmes when they are merry, and I knowe is vsed with the fruite of comfort by some, when, in sorrowfull pangs of their death-bringing sinnes, they find the consolation of the neuer-leauing goodnesse.[1]

He shows kinship to Du Bartas in his reply to the objection that poetry ensnares its readers in evil:

. . . how much it abuseth mens wit, trayning it to wanton sinfulnes and lustfull loue: for indeed that is the principall, if not the onely abuse I can heare alledged. They say the Comedies rather teach then reprehend amorous conceits. They say the Lirick is larded with passionate Sonnets, the Elegiack weepes the want of his mistresse, and that euen to the Heroical *Cupid* hath ambitiously climed. Alas, Loue, I would thou couldest as well defende thy selfe as thou canst offende others. I woulde those, on whom thou doost attend, could eyther put thee away, or yeelde good reason why they keepe thee. But grant loue of beautie to be a beastlie fault (although it be very hard, sith onely man, and no beast, hath that gyft to discerne beauty); grant that louely name of Loue to deserue all hatefull reproches (although euen some of my Maisters the Phylosophers spent a good deale of theyr Lamp-oyle in setting foorth the excellencie of it); grant, I say, what soeuer they wil haue granted; that not onely loue, but lust, but vanitie, but (if they list) scurrilitie, possesseth many leaues of the Poets bookes: yet thinke I, when this is granted, they will finde theyr sentence may with good manners put the last words foremost, and not say that Poetrie abuseth mans wit, but that mans wit abuseth Poetrie.

For I will not denie but that mans wit may make Poesie, which should be *Eikastike*, which some learned haue defined, figuring foorth good things, to be *Phantastike*, which doth, contrariwise, infect the fancie with vnworthy ob-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

iects, as the Painter, that shoulde giue to the eye eyther some excellent perspectiue, or some fine picture, fit for building or fortification, or contayning in it some notable example, as *Abraham* sacrificing his Sonne *Isaack*, *Iudith* killing *Holofernes*, *Dauid* fighting with *Goliath*, may leaue those, and please an ill-pleased eye with wanton shewes of better hidden matters. But what, shall the abuse of a thing make the right vse odious? Nay truely, though I yeeld that Poesie may not onely be abused, but that beeing abused, by the reason of his sweete charming force, it can doe more hurt then any other Armie of words, yet shall it be so far from concluding that the abuse should giue reproch to the abused, that contrariwise it is a good reason, that whatsoeuer, being abused, dooth most harme, beeing rightly vsed (and vpon the right vse each thing conceiueth his title), doth most good.[1]

Like Du Bartas he instances the alleged authority of Plato in banishing poets out of a commonwealth, answering that it was against the abuse of poetry that Plato was protesting and not against poetry itself:

Plato therefore (whose authoritie I had much rather iustly conster then vniustly resist) meant not in general of Poets, in those words of which *Iulius Scaliger* saith, *Qua authoritate barbari quidam atque hispidi abuti velint ad Poetas e republica exigendos*; but only meant to driue out those wrong opinions of the Deitie (whereof now, without further law, Christianity hath taken away all the hurtful beliefe), perchance (as he thought) norished by the then esteemed Poets. And a man need goe no further then to *Plato* himselfe to know his meaning: who, in his Dialogue called *Ion*, giueth high and rightly diuine commendation to Poetrie. So as *Plato*, banishing the abuse, not the thing, not banishing it, but giuing due honor vnto it, shall be our Patron and not our aduersarie. For indeed I had much rather (sith truly I may doe it) shew theyr mistaking of *Plato* (vnder whose Lyons skin they would make an Asse-like braying against Poesie) then goe about to ouerthrow his authority, whom, the wiser a man is, the more iust cause he shall find to haue in admiration; especially sith he attributeth vnto Poesie more then my selfe doe, namely, to be a very inspiring of a diuine force, farre aboue mans wit, as in the afore-named Dialogue is apparant.[2]

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 40–41.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 46. I am not unaware of the relationship of Giordano Bruno and Sidney, and of the importance of Bruno's *Degli Eroici Furori*, dedicated to Sidney, nor would I be thought to limit Sidney's broad view of poetry to Du Bartas' more centered concept. But that Sidney's attitude toward divine poetry bears the distinct impress of Du Bartas, or at least of the movement which produced Du Bartas, seems to me quite clear.

And, finally, when Sidney turns to ask why poetry in England was not then honored as elsewhere, he instances as patrons of poetry King Robert of Sicily, King Francis of France (the brother of Marguerite of Navarre), and King James of Scotland.

In 1595 there was published the first translation of Du Bartas by the man who was to become the acknowledged medium for Du Bartas to speak English, *The First Day of the Worldes Creation* as translated by Joshua Sylvester. The dedication apologized for the publication of the translation and apologized for the apology:

> . . . yet not in respect, either of the matter which is heauenly, nor the Author which is excellent, desired I to silence my infantlike pen from proceeding heerin: but bicause this most Christian Poet, and noble *Frenchman Lord of Bartas*, might haue been naturalized amongst vs, either by a generall act of a Poeticall Parliament: or haue obtained a kingly translator for his weeke (as he did for his Furies:) or rather a diuine *Sidney*, a stately *Spencer*, or a sweet *Daniell* for an interpreter thereof. For so was I put in a false hope by some, that the liuing Pen of that worthie deceased knight, had amongst other his charitable legacies bequeathed a rich suit, after our best English fashion, vnto this honorable Poet: and therefore suppressed my ragged weeds, till I perceiued their promise shrunke, & my expectation still naked. And yet if any of the fore-named Heroicall Spirits haue vndertaken the performance of that act, I would not haue my seelie daies worke to preiudice their Weeke, nor my moat to flutter in the presence of their bright beames: wherefore though my rash quill hath tooke a further flight into this translation: yet haue I pinioned vp the rest of hir fethers, and suffered onely the first daies worke to passe abroad: till I may vnderstand whether any of those sweete recording Swans haue waded in the deriuation of these streames or no: . . .[1]

In 1598 Sylvester seems to have grown less timorous. His dedication to Robert, Earl of Essex, of *The Second Weeke* was full of the praises of Essex and of Du Bartas and was less concerned with his own weakness. Furthermore, he presumed to redo the kingly translation of the invocation at the beginning of the *First Day of the Second Week*, as well as to include in its proper place a new translation of the section

[1] I have no wish to discuss here the matter of Sylvester's translations of Du Bartas. Professor G. C. Taylor's recent book on *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934) gives an adequate bibliography of the various treatments of this subject.

previously translated by King James — *The Furies*. Most significantly, however, Sylvester inserted in italics an addition to the *Invocation* with which the book opens, following the precedent set by James in an original invocation. In his own person he supplicated:

> And gracious guide, which doost all grace infuse,
> Since it hath pleas'd thee taske my tardy muse
> With these high theames, that through mine artles pen
> This holy Lampe may light my Countri-men:
> Ah teach my hand, tuch mine vnlearned lips,
> Least, as the Earths grosse body doth eclipse
> Bright Cynthiaes beames, when it is interpos'd
> Twixt her and *Phoebus*: so mine ill-dispos'd
> Darke, gloomy, ignorance, obscure the rayes
> Of this diuine Sunne of these learned dayes:
> O furnish me with an vn-vulgar stile,
> That I by this may wean our wanton Ile
> From *Ouids* heires, and their vnhallowed spell
> Heere charming sences, chaining soules in hell,
> Let this prouoke our modern wits to sacre
> Their wondrous gifts to honor thee their Maker:
> That our mysterious ELFINE Oracle,
> Deepe, morall, graue, inuentions miracle:
> My deere sweet DANIEL, sharpe-conceipted, breefe,
> Ciuill, sententious, for pure accents chiefe:
> And our new *NASO*, that so passionates
> Th'heroik sighes of loue sick Potentates.
> May change their subiect, and aduance their wings
> Vp to these higher and more holy things;
> And if (sufficient rich in selfe-inuention)
> They skorne (as I) to liue of strangers pension,
> Let them deuise new Weekes, new works, new waies
> To celebrate the supreme Prince of prayse. . . .

Here is the traditional message of Urania, the plea for the greatest of poets — Spenser, Daniel, and Drayton — to continue the work of Sidney, to dedicate their talents to Englishing this divine poetry of Du Bartas, or to create a new English divine poetry. Significantly, Sylvester opposes to this divine poetry that of Ovid's heirs who charm the senses and enchain the souls of men in hell.

Finally, when in 1605 Sylvester gathered together his translations

of Du Bartas previously made,[1] he dedicated his work to King James with an elaborate "Corona Dedicatoria," prefacing his collection, however, by his supreme tribute to Sidney in an address to the readers, arranged in a pyramid of print:

ENGLAND'S | Apelles (rather | OVR APOLLO) | WORLD'S — wonder | SIDNEY, | that rare more-then-man, | This LOVELY VENVS | first to LIMNE beganne, | With such a PENCILL | as no PENNE dares followe: | How thẽ shold I, in Wit & Art so shalow, | Attẽpt the *Task* which yet none other can? | Far be the thought that mine vnlearned hand | His heauenly Labour shold so much vnhallow, | Yet least (that Holy-RELIQVE being shrin'd | In som High-Place, close lockt frō cōmmon light) | My Country-men should bee debar'd the sight | Of these DIVINE pure Beauties of the Minde; | Not daring meddle with APELLES TABLE; | This haue I muddled as my MVSE was able.

Florio speaks of having seen Sidney's translation,[2] but thus far no scholar has found the key that might unlock the secret of the high place in which it has been kept from common light.

The interest in divine poetry of the whole Sidney group, and particularly of those whose names have been linked with the true or fictional *Areopagus*, is of special significance. And among the members of the inner circle Gabriel Harvey ranked high in his insistent praise of Du Bartas. The oft-quoted passage from *Pierces Supererogation* shows the persistent linking of James with the whole tradition:

. . . And now whiles I consider, what a Trompet of Honour, Homer hath bene to sturre-vp many woorthy Princes; I cannot forget the woorthy Prince, that is a Homer to himselfe, a Golden spurre to Nobility, a Scepter to Vertue, a Verdure to the Spring, a Sunne to the day; and hath not onely translated the two diuine Poems of Salustius du Bartas, his heauenly Vrany, and his hellish Furies: but hath readd a most valorous Martial Lecture vnto himselfe in his owne victorious Lepanto, a short, but heroicall worke, in meeter, but royal meeter, fitt for a Dauids harpe. Lepanto, first the glory of Christendome

[1] *Bartas: His Deuine Weekes and Workes*, translated by Joshua Sylvester (London, 1605).

[2] The epistle addressed to the Countess of Rutland and Lady Penelope Rich, and prefixed to the second book of Florio's translation of *The Essayes of Montaigne* (London, 1603), says that he has seen Sidney's translation of "the first septmaine of that Arch-Poet *du Bartas*," and begs these ladies that they "be so good to all, as all this age may see, and after ages honor."

against the Turke; and now the garland of a soueraine crowne. When young Kings haue such a care of their flourishing Prime; and like Cato, are ready to render an accompt of their vacant howers; as if Aprill were their Iuly, and May their August: how should gentlemen of yeeres, employ the golden talent of their Industry, and trauaile? . . . Phy vpon fooleries: there be honourable woorkes to doe; and notable workes to read. The afore-named Bartas, (whome elsewhere I haue stiled the Treasurer of Humanity, and the Ieweller of Diuinity) for the highnesse of his subiect, and the maiesty of his verse, nothing inferiour vnto Dante, (whome some Italians preferre before Virgil, or Homer,) a right inspired and enrauished Poet; full of chosen, graue, profound, venerable, and stately matter; euen in the next Degree to the sacred, and reuerend stile of heauenly Diuinity it selfe. *In a manner the onely Poet, whom Vrany hath voutsafed to Laureate with her owne heauenly hand*: and worthy to bee alleadged of Diuines, and Counsellours, as Homer is quoted of Philosophers, and Oratours. Many of his solemne verses, are oracles: & one Bartas, that is, one French Salomõ, more weighty in stern, and mighty counsell, then the Seauen Sages of Greece. Neuer more beauty in vulgar Languages: but his stile addeth fauour, and grace to beauty; and in a goodly Boddy representeth a puissant Soule. How few verses carry such a personage of state? or how few argumentes, such a spirite of maiesty? Or where is the diuine instincte, that can sufficiently commend such a volume of celestiall inspiration? . . . Great Exercises become great personages: . . .[1]

It is not necessary to record here all Harvey's references to Du Bartas, but it is well to note that his particular epithet for Du Bartas, twice recorded in his marginalia, is the "divine Homer." It is also necessary to note that he classes Du Bartas with the great ones of all time:

Adde Plutarcho Homerum: Homero Virgilium: Virgilio Bartasium: et habes egregium magisterium. Nihil supra.

Euripides, poetarum sapientissimus: excepto tandem diuino Bartasio.

. . . Petrarcha, Ariostus, Tassus, plus habent et ciuilis ingenij, et heroici animi. Nouissimè etiam Sallustius Bartasius, in lingua Gallica, ipse est Homerus diuinus. Nihil umquam tale in Gallia.[2]

[1] *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, ed. A. B. Grosart (London, 1884–85), II, 102–4. The italics are mine.

[2] *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, collected and edited by G. C. Moore Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), pp. 137, 115 and 168, respectively. There are several other references to

Curiously, critics have generally ignored Spenser's interest in divine poetry, but Harvey records the commendation bestowed by Spenser on Du Bartas:

M. Spenser conceiues the like pleasure in the fourth day of the firste Weeke of Bartas. Which he esteemes as the proper profession of Urania.[1]

It should be noted, too, that in "L'Envoy" to the *Ruines of Rome* Spenser, after praising Bellay as immortal and excelling all other poets of France who had gone before him, adds his praise of Bartas:

> And after thee, gins *Bartas* hie to rayse
> His heavenly Muse, th'Almightie to adore.[2]

Furthermore, it seems to me impossible to dissociate the Urania of Du Bartas and the Urania of *The Teares of the Muses*. This Urania of Spenser's poem bewails the love of darkness and of blindness in human minds. She finds in knowledge the difference between man and beast, and she sees in ignorance the enemy of grace. Certainly, Spenser's Urania is a Christian Muse, as she recounts the fruits of knowledge:

> Through knowledge we behold the worlds creation,
> How in his cradle first he fostred was;
> And judge of Natures cunning operation,
> How things she formed of a formlesse mas:
> By knowledge wee do learne our selues to knowe,
> And what to man, and what to God wee owe.
>
> From hence wee mount aloft unto the skie,
> And looke into the Christall firmament.
> There we behold the heavens great *Hierarchie*,
> The Starres pure light, the Spheres swift movement,
> The Spirites and Intellegences fayre,
> And Angels waighting on th'Almightyies chayre.
>
> And there with humble minde and high insight,
> Th'eternall Makers maiestie wee viewe,

Du Bartas in the works gathered by Mr. Moore Smith, and elsewhere. I have given these only as samples.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

[2] I have used, for references to Spenser's minor poems, the editions of W. L. Renwick, *Complaints* (London, 1928), and *Daphnaïda and Other Poems* (London, 1929).

His love, his truth, his glorie, and his might,
And mercie more than mortall men can vew.
O soveraigne Lord, ô soveraigne happinesse
To see thee, and thy mercie measurelesse.

Such happines have they that do embrace
The precepts of my heavenlie discipline,
But shame and sorrow and accursed case
Have they, that scorne the schoole of arts divine.
And banish mee which doo professe the skill
To make men heavenly wise, through humbled will.

It is bewildering to find Professor Stein giving a late date to "L'Envoy" of the *Ruines of Rome* in his recent *Studies in Spenser's Complaints*, on the ground that Spenser could not have referred to Du Bartas as a "heavenly" poet on the basis of his *Urania*, and insisting that *The Teares of the Muses* must, therefore, have postdated the greater work of Du Bartas, his *Divine Weekes*.[1] It is even more puzzling to find Professor Renwick annotating the *Ruines of Rome l'envoy* by a reference to *L'Uranie* of Du Bartas [2] and then commenting on the *Urania* of *The Teares of the Muses*:

> This is typical of the mixed origins of Spenser's philosophy, and of the comprehensive welcome extended by sixteenth-century scholars, especially in England, to every system that carried the prestige of learning and the promise of wisdom. The age of Elizabeth was one of transition in thought; . . . Here Spenser summarizes rapidly the content of philosophical studies, *forgetting for a moment the Muse of Astronomy* in his pleased recollections of the Bible, Cicero, Christian theology, natural philosophy, and ethics.[3]

It should be remembered that Spenser refers to the Countess of Pembroke, Sidney's sister, as Urania in *Colin Clout's Come Home Again*, because in her mind

"All heauenly gifts and riches locked are"—

a reference certainly not intended to suggest the Countess of Pembroke as a woman wise in the ways of astronomy.[4]

[1] Harold Stein, *Studies in Spenser's Complaints* (New York, 1934), pp. 63–64. Professor Stein describes the *Urania* as "a short work of no consequence."

[2] W. L. Renwick, ed. Spenser's *Complaints* (1928), p. 248.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 215. The italics are mine.

[4] See ll. 485–91.

To anyone familiar with the Urania tradition, moreover, the invocation with which Spenser begins the second of the *Cantos of Mutabilitie* reveals him as turning to the Heavenly Muse when he would write of heavenly things:

> Ah! whither doost thou now thou greater Muse
> Me from these woods and pleasing forrests bring?
> And my fraile spirit (that dooth oft refuse
> This too high flight, vnfit for her weake wing)
> Lift vp aloft, to tell of heauens King
> (Thy soueraine Sire) his fortunate successe,
> And victory, in bigger noates to sing,
> Which he obtain'd against that *Titanesse*,
> That him of heauens Empire sought to dispossesse.
>
> Yet sith I needs must follow thy behest,
> Do thou my weaker wit with skill inspire,
> Fit for this turne; and in my feeble brest
> Kindle fresh sparks of that immortall fire,
> Which learned minds inflameth with desire
> Of heauenly things: for, who but thou alone,
> That art yborne of heauen and heauenly Sire,
> Can tell things doen in heauen so long ygone;
> So farre past memory of man that may be knowne.[1]

But it is, I think, most clearly in the *Fowre Hymnes* that we see the influence of Du Bartas' *L'Uranie*. The dedication reveals the usual device:

> HAUING in the greener times of my youth, composed these former two Hymnes in the praise of Loue and beautie, and finding that the same too pleased those of like age & disposition, which being too vehemently caried with that kind of affection, do rather sucke out poyson to their strong passion then hony to their honest delight, I was moued by the one of you two most excellent Ladies, to call in the same. But being vnable so to doe, by reason that many copies thereof were formerly scattered abroad, I resolued at least to amend, and by way of retraction to reforme them, making instead of those two Hymnes of earthly or naturall loue and beautie, two others of heauenly and celestiall.[2]

[1] *Spenser's Faerie Queene*, ed. J. C. Smith (Oxford, 1909), II, 468–69.

[2] The dedication is addressed to Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, and Mary, Countess of Warwick.

It has frequently been noted that Spenser is at least inconsistent in giving his authority to the publication of the two early hymns in connection with the later two, and, since there is no record of their previous publication, scholars have recently tended to regard the four hymns as a literary unit.[1] The dedication must, then, be looked upon as part of the literary structure. The Uranian repentance is repeated in the second stanza of *An Hymne of Heauenly Love*:

> Many lewd layes (ah woe is me the more)
> In praise of that mad fit, which fooles call loue,
> I haue in th'heat of youth made heretofore,
> That in light wits did loose affection moue.
> But all those follies now I do reproue,
> And turned haue the tenor of my string,
> The heauenly prayses of true loue to sing.

The hymn proper tells the Christian story of God, who was, eternally; of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who were created to rule with him before time began; of the creation of the hierarchy of the angels; of the fall of the angels through pride; of the creation of man and of his fall; of the incarnation of God as Christ; of Christ's life and his sacrifice. The invocation is to the Holy Spirit:

> Yet ô most blessed Spirit, pure lampe of light,
> Eternall spring of grace and wisedome trew,
> Vouchsafe to shed into my barren spright,
> Some little drop of thy celestiall dew,
> That may my rymes with sweet infuse embrew,
> And giue me words equall vnto my thought,
> To tell the marvueiles by thy mercie wrought.

Here, then, in this hymn Spenser uses the formula of *L'Uranie*. Repenting his "lewd layes," he turns to heavenly themes. Invoking the Holy Spirit as his muse, he recites the whole Christian story. Finally, he pleads that earth may lift eyes to heaven, attaining, through the contemplation of Christ and his love, to heavenly thoughts and inspiration.

[1] Professor Edwin Greenlaw was, I believe, the first to advance this theory. See his "Spenser's Influence on *Paradise Lost*," in *Studies in Philology*, XVII, 320–59.

In *An Hymne of Heauenly Beauty* Spenser progresses from this point, describing himself

> RApt with the rage of mine own rauisht thought,
> Through contemplation of those goodly sights,
> And glorious images in heauen wrought;

and he again invokes the "almightie Spright, | From whom all guifts of wit and knowledge flow." As he takes his reader,

> Beginning then below, with th'easie vew
> Of this base world, subject to fleshly eye,
> From thence to mount aloft, by order dew,
> To contemplation of th'immortal sky,

he conducts him to the very throne of God:

> There in his bosome *Sapience* doth sit,
> The soueraine dearling of the *Deity*,
> Clad like a Queene in royall robes, most fit
> For so great powre and peerelesse maiesty,
> And all with gemmes and iewels gorgeously
> Adornd, that brighter then the starres appeare,
> And make her natiue brightnes seem more cleare.
>
> And on her head a crowne of purest gold
> Is set, in signe of soueraignty;
> And in her hand a scepter she doth hold,
> With which she rules the house of God on hy,
> And menageth the euer-mouing sky,
> And in the same these lower creatures all
> Subiected to her powre imperiall.

The rest of the hymn describes the bliss which comes to one who is allowed by God to behold Heavenly Beauty or Sapience, and the willingness with which he puts away the false beauties that have heretofore fed his senses.

When it is remembered that Heavenly Beauty is personified as Venus Urania in Ficino,[1] the following comment by Professor Ren-

[1] *Ibid.*; H. E. Cory, *Edmund Spenser* (Berkeley, 1917), pp. 351–54. J. B. Fletcher, "A Study in Renaissance Mysticism: Spenser's 'Fowre Hymnes,'" *PMLA*, XXVI, 452–75. Discussion of related ideas is to be found in Josephine W. Bennett, "Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*: Addenda," *Studies in Philology*, XXXII, 131–57, and in an earlier paper, in *ibid.*, XXVIII, 18–57, and XXX, 160–92.

wick on Spenser's Sapience suggests that another link in the chain may well be added:

> Spenser had to find a parallel to or substitute for Venus capable of support by Christian authority. In Ficino he found Heavenly Beauty identified with Sapience, and he found Sapience in his Bible and Apocrypha.[1]

To this explanation I should add that, in Du Bartas, Spenser found a description of Urania which he combined with that of the Venus Urania and Sapience, conceiving her to be one who "rules the house of God on hy, | And menageth the euer-mouing sky." To me it seems that the whole description of Sapience is reminiscent of that of Urania.

But, according to Professor Fletcher, Sapience is to be identified as the Holy Ghost;[2] and here again it should be noted that, when the Muse of Astronomy was taken over as the Heavenly Muse, the muse of Christian poetry, the invocations offered to her employed much the same language as those earlier offered to the Holy Ghost. Such invocations as were used in Christian poetry continued throughout the Renaissance to be addressed to muse or Holy Spirit in practically identical terms. Often both were invoked in a continuous passage, a typical instance occurring in "An Intraduction to Saint Peters Teares":

> Imaginarie *Muses* get you gone,
> And you of *Ideas* idle company:
> That place your Paradice in *Cetheron*,
> And call vpon the Nimphes of *Thessalie*.
> Restraine your haughtie metaphorick lines:
> For reuerent truth your glory vndermines.
>
> The Throne of Heauen is her holy hill,
> Whence flowes the Spring of sauing health:
> In steed of birdes Archangels sing her will,
> The Temple is her loue, and peace her wealth.
> O sacred sweete, and sweetest sacred substance:
> Vnloose the Springs of *Peters* poore repentance.
>
> And thou O holy Ghost and sacred spirit,
> Faire milke white Doue, vnto the meekest lambe:

[1] Renwick, *Daphnaïda and Other Poems*, p. 212.
[2] *Op. cit.*

The minister of heauen, the Lord of merit,
The gladdest messenger that euer came.
Infuse thy grace so sweetely in mine eares,
That I may truely write Saint *Peters* Teares.[1]

Parallel passages from poems of the same period show the indifference with which muse or Holy Spirit was named. Gervas Markham, in *The Teares of the Beloved*, addresses his prayer to the Holy Spirit:

Thou first and last, author and cause of all,
That wast with God, before these worlds were made,
Thou perfect Good, whom I Gods word will call,
Most soueraigne grace, so with thy grace me trade,
That from thy fauors, as from fountaine rare
In flowing sort, I may thy selfe declare.[2]

John Davies of Hereford, in *The Mvses Sacrifice*, addresses the muse:

O then, thou great vnlimitable *Muse*,
(that rests, in motion, in th'ETERNALS *Breast*)
Inspire my *Muse*, with *grace* her *pow'r* to vse
in nought, but what to thee shall be addrest:
So shall that *Spirit* that made thy *Dauid* sing,
Make *Dauies* too, (a Begger) like a *King*.[3]

King James prayed,

"To make thy holie Spreit my Muse";[4]

and Samuel Austin (in a passage quoted later in this paper) more definitely besought that

"Thy Spirit bee my Vrania, . . ."[5]

The habitual telescoping of ideas concerning the Holy Ghost and Urania, on the one hand, and the natural linking of Venus Urania to the Urania of Christian poesy, on the other, seem to me to make it

[1] *Saint Peters Ten Teares* (London, 1597).

[2] [Gervas Markham] *The Teares of the Beloved: or, The Lamentation of Saint Iohn* (London, 1600), opening stanza.

[3] "The Author, of, and to his Muse," prefixed to *The Mvses Sacrifice* (London, 1612).

[4] *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises* (Edinburgh, 1591), fol. H 2r.

[5] Samuel Austin, *Austins Vrania, or, The Heavenly Muse* (London, 1629), p. 7.

credible that Spenser was definitely influenced by the Urania of Du Bartas when he composed the *Fowre Hymnes*.

It is no part of my design to try to explain a poet of Spenser's greatness and complexity by imposing a single formula upon any part of his work. But I wish to suggest that the *Fowre Hymnes* may profitably be compared to the *Vrania*, in that they follow the traditional pattern in accounting for the poet's turning from secular to divine song, in that *An Hymne of Heauenly Beautie* rehearses the Christian story as Urania of *The Teares of the Muses* says that Knowledge would reveal it, and in that Sapience resembles the Heavenly Muse, who from being linked with the Holy Ghost as the inspirer of divine poetry gradually had bestowed upon her the attributes of the Holy Spirit.

The continued acceptance of Urania as the Heavenly Muse throughout the seventeenth century is attested, not only by the invocations addressed to her, but also by the divine poetry which was published under the title of *Urania*.[1]

The first of the *Urania*'s with which I am familiar is that of Nathaniel Baxter, who, as the former Greek teacher of Philip and Mary Sidney, dedicated to Mary, Countess of Pembroke, *Sir Philip Sydneys Ourânia*, published in 1606. In the first of the dedications he said:

> Hee humbly sues that hee released be,
> Of arrogancy, and proesumption,
> That he without his knights iniunction
> Should dedicate vnto thy princely Shrine,
> The treasurie, and hidden function,
> Of *Iehovahs* Hexameron diuine.

Referring to himself as Endimion, he describes the poem in its subtitle as *Endimions Song and Tragedie, Containing all Philosophie*. As

[1] Two poems of similar title, which are not divine works, should be noted. The first is *The Countesse of Montgomeries Urania*, by Lady Mary Wroth (London, 1621), an Arcadian romance. The second is *Urania, The Woman in the Moone*, by William Basse, published with separate title-page in *The Pastorals and Other Workes* (Oxford, 1653). I have seen only the Collier reprint (London [n.d.]); Collier (p. ii) describes the work:

"A mythological fancy, . . . founded upon the notion that Jupiter, having accidentally, and unintentionally, elevated a woman to the heavens, was afterwards obliged to banish her to the moon (where she is still seen) in consequence of the disputes and jealousies she created in the 'celestial family.'"

this subtitle indicates, the poem is a long, wandering, theological-philosophical composition. The reason for the choice of the title is, however, indicated in the lines here quoted. To its author, at least, it seemed to record "The treasurie, and hidden function, | Of *Iehovahs* Hexameron diuine."

The next of the *Urania*'s is that of Drummond of Hawthornden, a collection of divine poems published with the *Poems* of 1614.[1]

In 1615 appeared *Taylors Vrania, or His Heauenly Muse*,[2] a long religious poem of God and of creation, of man's nature, of the struggle of reason and passion, of man as microcosmos — a not unpoetical philosophical-theological hodgepodge. The preliminary verses addressed to the Water Poet are many and various. Thomas Brewer hammered out his tribute:

> Thou liu'st in water, but the fire in thee;
> That mounting Element, that made thee chuse
> To Court *Vrania*, the diuinest Muse.

Thomas Dekker poetized:

> Some say, there is a *Ferryman* of *Hell*,
> The *Ferryman* of *Heau'n*, I now know well,
> And that's thy Selfe, transporting *Soules* to *blisse*,
> VRANIA sits at *Helme* and *Pilot* is; . . .

The tributes show how common was the acceptance of Urania as the Heavenly Muse.

More important, in consideration of the bearing of all this upon the Milton tradition, is the work of Samuel Austin, which appeared in 1629. *Austins Vrania, or, The Heavenly Mvse* is particularly noteworthy for its contents as described in its subtitle, *Being a true story of mans fall and redemption, set-forth in a Poem containing two Bookes: whereof one resembles the Law, the other the Gospell.* As far as I have been able to ascertain, this book has never been noted by Milton scholars. The poem is confused in structure, uneven in poetic quality; but here, under the title of *Urania*, is a poem in two books, one describing

[1] *The Poetical Works of William Drummond Of Hawthornden*, ed. L. E. Kastner for the Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh and London, 1913), I, 85–95. See also pp. lii–lviii, for the collation of this volume.

[2] By John Taylor, the Water Poet.

the fall of man, the other his redemption. The dedication to "Mr. Dr. Prideavx, the Kings Professor of Diuinitie, and the most deseruing Rector of Exeter Colledge in Oxford," explains:

If I had made choice of any other Muse then *Vrania*; or if my Subiect were not Diuine, I would not haue presum'd to approach your eyes with it, or intreate the world might know it vnder your Patronage.

The invocation in this poem is extremely interesting in its linking of the Holy Ghost and Urania, as well as in its rationalizing of the plea for divine poesy:

Call me, as earst thy *Samuel* from his sleepe,
And as thy *Dauid* from his flocke of sheepe,
To sing thy prayses: Let my Poesy
Be as the words of weeping *Jeremy*,
To pierce the stoniest heart, and to inuite
The dullest Eares attention when I write:
Thy Spirit bee my Vrania, to distill
Such sacred Measures into this my quill,
That euery line it writes may reach a straine
Beyond the high conceits of Natures braine;
To shew from whence it came; and then my Layes
Shall still bee Ecchoes of my Makers Praise:
And when our brauest Poets chance to see
The vertue of Diuiner Poesie,
They'le change their Tenors all, and glory most,
To bee the *Pen-man of the Holy Ghost*.[1]

[1] Pp. 7–8. The italics in lines 7–10 and 16 are mine. Prefixed to Austin's work is an address to his friends, Mr. M. Drayton and Mr. Will. Browne, and his kinsman, Mr. Andrew Pollexsen, in which he described his own experiences in selling divine poetry:

"Abroad vnto my Countrimen, I went
To see how well our Stationers were bent
To further me herein: but they reply,
Sure 'twill not take, for 'tis Diuinitie:
Poems diuine are nothing worth; but if
I had portray'd a pretty Sea of griefe
For some lost Mistresse; or compos'[d] a toy
Of loue in verse, this would haue been a Boy
Worth the conception, each would take it vp
And play with it: or had I but a cup
Of strong-breath'd Satyres mixt with spleene & gall,

In 1654 appeared *Divine and Moral Speculations in Metrical Numbers*, by "Dr. R. *Aylet*, one of the Masters of the High Court of *Chancery*."[1] The work contained many divine poems, among them a version of the Song of Songs (done in Spenserian stanza and constituting an interesting contribution to Spenseriana) and — more relevant to the subject of this paper — *Urania, or the Heavenly Muse*, a long poem modeled closely on that of Du Bartas. It begins with an account of the poet's having reviewed subjects that might serve for his verse, when in harvest time he had leisure to compose his mind to holy meditation. He considered the possibilities of comedy and tragedy, of a poem concerning the union of the houses after the Wars of the Roses, or about the reign of James; he was prone to sing of Venus; but, while still unresolved,

> Behold I see an heau'nly *apparition*,
> Some herauld doubtless from the *Queen of Love*.
>
> Her gesture and her grace angelical,
> With wings whereby her self to heav'n she rears;
> Her countenance fair, sweet, celestial,
> Her voice like Musick of the heav'nly Sphears.
>
>
>
> On shoulders hangs her *azure mantle* light,
> With silver spangles all adorned fair,
> Twinkling like brightest stars on frosty night,
> As they are moved by the gentle ayr.
>
> Her nether parts to hide from vulgar eye
> A Kirtle like *heav'ns Canopy* did cover;
> Where all the Signes of heav'n imbroidred fly,
> And all the *Graces* seem about to hover.

> And could but powre it handsomely to fall
> Vpon some high-mans head, Oh, this would take
> Eu'n like Tobacco, each Barbours shop would make
> A sale of it: or had I but the time
> Neately to weaue some loose-lasciuious rime,
> Stuft with conceits of wantonnesse, Oh ther
> I had been call'd one of the Wits; for men
> Must haue their humours, now they say; . . ."

[1] A. B. Grosart, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, says the poems were probably published separately long before 1654.

I, saith she, am *Vrania* to thee sent,
From thine adored *Mistriss*, *Queen of Love*;
I ravish Soules above the Firmament,
That they in *Numbers* like the Spheres may move.
.
For I the *Spirit* am of *Contemplation*,
Th' *Elixir* or *Ambrosia* divine,
Pure *Angells food*, Soules sweetest delectation, . . .

She then speaks of the inspiration of the poet through heavenly love, but she recalls the different sorts of love that have brought poetry into being, instancing as examples the work of Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Spenser, Bartas, David, and others, but reserving her highest praise for David. She then advises the poet:

Thy *Soul*, whose *being* is Celestial fire,
Must like the *Saints* be rapt up in a trance,
And *extased* with holiest desire,
If thou thy Verse wouldst up to heav'n advance.

She reproaches the poet for basely using the gift of poetry, she insists that evil uses of poetry account for its having been banished by wise men, she emphasizes the immortality of divine verse, she recites the whole canon of divine song from the Bible, she acknowledges the fact that the devil has set his forces to use song for evil purposes, she insists upon primitive poetry as pure and good, she stresses the appropriateness of divine subjects and points out particularly the Song of Songs as offering opportunity to sing of divine love. The poet was so ravished by her words, that, though he could never hope even to touch the laurel bough, he yet dedicated the service of his muse to holy things.

I said at the beginning of this paper that it seemed to me both unnecessary and far-fetched to account for Milton's choice of Urania as his muse by invoking a knowledge of rabbinical lore and by assuming his interest in the sex life of God. Many streams of influence must be considered in the history of the movement which led to the all-pervading interest of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in divine poetry, and I have tried here to isolate one of these channels of influence. But it seems to me clearly evident, even in this partial review, that the acceptance of Urania as the muse of Christian poetry

was so well established by Milton's time that he was bound by tradition to invoke her aid when he wrote the Christian story. Furthermore, it seems clear that Milton's theory of divine poetry was that which he held in common with all Christian poets of his time: that he was writing in a tradition much older than Du Bartas but formulated by him for the Renaissance of Christian poetry. If this is so, it demands a reconsideration of Milton as Urania's poet.

That Milton early called upon the Heavenly Muse for aid has not been, I think, sufficiently emphasized. Yet in his ode *On the Morning of* CHRISTS *Nativity* he wrote:

> Say Heav'nly Muse, shall not thy sacred vein
> Afford a present to the Infant God?
> Hast thou no vers, no hymn, or solemn strein,
> To welcom him to this his new abode, . . .

When at last he comes to the writing of *Paradise Lost*, the first invocation makes the usual association with the Heavenly Muse as the inspirer of the biblical writers and then identifies the Muse with the Holy Ghost:

> Sing Heav'nly Muse, that on the secret top
> Of *Oreb*, or of *Sinai*, didst inspire
> That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,
> In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth
> Rose out of *Chaos*: or if *Sion* Hill
> Delight thee more, and *Siloa's* Brook that flow'd
> Fast by the Oracle of God; I thence
> Invoke thy aid to my adventrous Song,
>
> And chiefly Thou O Spirit, that dost prefer
> Before all Temples th' upright heart and pure,
> Instruct me, for Thou know'st; Thou from the first
> Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread
> Dove-like satst brooding on the vast Abyss
> And mad'st it pregnant: . . . [1]

In Book III [2] Milton again refers to his muse as the Heavenly Muse, but it is the invocation of Book VII that has been most troublesome to Milton scholars:

[1] *Paradise Lost*, I, i, 6–13, 17–22.

[2] III, 19–32.

Descend from Heav'n *Urania*, by that name
If rightly thou art call'd, whose Voice divine
Following, above th' *Olympian* Hill I soare,
Above the flight of *Pegasean* wing.
The meaning, not the Name I call: for thou
Nor of the Muses nine, nor on the top
Of old *Olympus* dwell'st, but Heav'nlie borne,
Before the Hills appeerd, or Fountain flow'd,
Thou with Eternal wisdom didst converse,
Wisdom thy Sister, and with her didst play
In presence of th' Almightie Father, pleas'd
With thy Celestial Song. . . .[1]

This is, indeed, the most complex of the invocations, but certain difficulties are cleared away, it seems to me, by the history of the tradition which I have in brief summarized. The usual opposition of Sion to Olympus, of the dove to Pegasus, of the Christian muse to the pagan muses, is inherent in the first four lines. In the rest of the passage Milton clearly bows to tradition in invoking the Heavenly Muse, but at the same time makes it clear that he is using a literary symbol when he names *Urania*. Definitely he explains, "The meaning, not the Name I call," as he reiterates that his muse was not of the pagan muses, that she did not dwell on Olympus, but that she was of Heaven. Finally, he addresses his supplication to the reality behind the name, and here he describes the Third Person of the Trinity.[2] A few lines later, Milton turns again to Urania,[3] and once more he contrasts the heavenly with the pagan muses, using the story of Orpheus as the classical background for his own Christian supplication for aid against the Bacchanalian revelers. It is interesting to note that he also asks the aid of Urania in finding the "fit audience," which like all divine poets he accepts as inevitably "few."

What I have written in regard to Milton's muse will but justify Professor Hanford's judgment:

[1] VII, 1–12.

[2] The conception of Sapience and Wisdom embodied in *The Court of Sapience*, a late Middle-English poem attributed during the Renaissance to Lydgate, is interesting and, I think, important in relation to Spenser's *Hymnes* and to this invocation of Milton. See the edition by Dr. Robert Spindler (Leipzig, 1927), especially pp. 124, 129, 192–95.

[3] VII, 30–39.

The Heavenly Muse (i. e., Urania, originally the Muse of astronomy) is in reality that divine inspiration which revealed the truths of religion to Moses. It is also the spirit of God which dwells in the heart of every believer. In Christian terminology it is the Holy Ghost.[1]

But the history of the tradition of Urania as a muse, and of the theory of divine literature for which she stood as symbol from the time of Du Bartas' poem, seems to me to aid in a new orientation of Milton as a divine poet. A broader acquaintance with the whole movement should, I believe, while removing Milton from his isolation, give new significance to the words of Courthope:

I think it can be shown (1) that, in the composition of these religious poems, Milton followed the practice, which he had been developing from his youth up, of adapting classical forms to Christian materials; (2) that, in the selection of his subject and in the details of its treatment, his receptive genius was greatly influenced by the stream of contemporary tendency and the example of particular poets; . . .[2]

That there was a movement, of which Milton was a part, dedicated to opposing the paganizing and secularizing of literature throughout the Renaissance, seems to me the final teaching of the history of Urania.[3]

[1] J. H. Hanford, *A Milton Handbook* (London, 1927), p. 149.

[2] W. J. Courthope, *A History of English Poetry*, III, (London, 1903), 404.

[3] To Professor Hoyt Hudson, with whom I have discussed the contents of this paper, I am indebted for both criticism and suggestions..

Jaques

By OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

SINCE 1905 most competent critics have regarded Jaques as that type of melancholy man which the Elizabethans called "malcontent." In that year Professor E. E. Stoll attempted to fix its distinguishing marks and to show that Jaques possessed most of these characteristics.[1] The author of the present essay believes this to be a mistaken view. An examination of the occurrences of the term in English literature of the late sixteenth century convinces him that the word, although then widely current, was so inexactly used that it could not have suggested to Shakespeare's contemporaries any clearly defined type of eccentric. Yet Jaques' state of mind would almost surely have been recognized as something more specific than mere vague sadness and general discontent. It would probably have been identified with some one of the carefully differentiated forms of melancholy scientifically described in many of the medical treatises of the sixteenth century — volumes which served also as handbooks of the psychological notions of the age. To the development of these two ideas the first parts of this essay are devoted. Its last two sections seek to establish more accurately than hitherto has been possible Jaques' precise dramatic function, through an examination of the role of similar humorous melancholiacs in other comedies of the time and through a study of his relation to the contemporary vogue of both formal satire and satiric comedy.

I

Professor Stoll derived his term from Marston's play called *The Malcontent*. The title describes Malevole, a name which Altofronto, a deposed Duke of Genoa, gives to a disguise which he assumes. Stoll

[1] E. E. Stoll, "Shakspere, Marston and the Malcontent Type," *Modern Philology*, III (1905–6), 281–303.

believes that Malevole is the most completely drawn portrait of the type to which both he and Jaques belong.[1] He enumerates what he conceives to be their more important resemblances:

> The points of similarity between Jaques and Malevole are many. Both appear constantly, not as plain human beings, but as "humorous" Malcontents in their professional garb of cynicism and melancholy: of this, directly or indirectly, they and their interlocutors never fail to remind us. As such, they, like the Fool, hold a privileged position: they are "as free as air, and blow on whom they please." Freest they are with their master the Duke, and he in return is fondest of them; and with the other persons of the drama they are pretty uniformly blunt and cynical, or ironically friendly. With the Fool, however — Passarello in the *Malcontent* and Touchstone in *As You Like It* — they are on excellent terms. They draw him out, revel in his grotesque wisdom, and eagerly fling it in the face of the more foolish world. Their conversation is alike lively, abrupt, fantastically phrased; but both are most at home in the set, isolated speech or soliloquy. Here appear their essentially melancholy and Malcontent bias, their railing at the follies and abuses of society, at classes like courtiers and ladies, and at "the world" in general, and their contemplation — in picturesque fashion — of the vanity and transitoriness of human pretentions, distinctions, and existence itself.[2]

Some of the similarities enumerated in this paragraph may be questioned. It is doubtful, for example, whether Jaques wears a professional garb of cynicism in any such fashion as does Malevole. The former's melancholy has not been donned, but is an inevitable product of his unbalanced nature. But many of the characteristics mentioned by Stoll are clearly common to Malevole and Jaques. Yet the similarities are of different kinds. Some are qualities of their personalities and some, such as their relation to other characters in the play, are those of dramatic function. Indeed, it is seldom clear whether Mr. Stoll believed the term "malcontent" to describe an Elizabethan personality or a conventional dramatic type.

Furthermore, Malevole and Jaques are as often unlike as alike.

[1] When Professor Stoll wrote his article, he also believed that Jaques was "a recast of the title-hero, Malevole." But few, if any, scholars now think that *The Malcontent* was composed before *As You Like It*. However, the important question at issue is not the discovery of a model for Jaques, but the existence of a malcontent type.

[2] Stoll, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

The former calls himself "a desperate malcontent," and adopts many attitudes and performs many actions which resemble those of a professed cynic — sometimes, in fact, they are as extreme as those of Shakespeare's Timon of Athens. At Malevole's initial appearance he expresses extravagant pessimism. We first hear discordant music off stage, evidently of his own making, and then his voice railing at Ferrardo. The vituperative terms he applies to him — "Duke's Ganymede," "shadow of a woman," and "smooth-chinned catamite" — show Malevole to be a railing misanthropist. The Duke Pietro's description of him, which follows, confirms us in our first impression:

> This Malevole is one of the most prodigious affections that ever conversed with nature: a man, or rather a monster more discontent than Lucifer when he was thrust out of the presence. His appetite is unsatiable as the grave; as far from any content as from heaven: his highest delight is to procure others vexation, and therein he thinks he truly serves heaven; for 'tis his position, whosoever in this earth can be contented is a slave and damned; . . . his own soul is at variance within herself; his speech is halter-worthy at all hours. I like him, faith: he gives good intelligence to my spirit, makes me understand those weaknesses which others' flattery palliates.[1]

This description emphasizes not only his discontent, but also the most important of his dramatic functions — his devotion to corrective satire. He expresses the spirit which Marston rescued from his forbidden formal satires [2] and introduced into his plays that succeeded them. Consequently, Malevole is a new vehicle for his author's persistent zeal for reform, particularly of licentiousness. On occasion the satire degenerates into moral exhortation appropriate to the latest mouthpiece of Marston, the satirist, but foreign to the character of the whimsical and remote Jaques. The following passage of rhymed couplets at the close of the second act of *The Malcontent* illustrates this phenomenon:

[1] John Marston, *The Malcontent*, I, i, 26–40 (*The Works of John Marston*, ed. A. H. Bullen [London, 1887], I, 210–11).

[2] By order of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, issued June 1, 1599, both "Pigmalion with certaine other Satyres" and "The scourge of villanye," along with other works of similar satiric character, were to be seized and burned. See *Stationers' Registers* (Arber's transcript), III, 677.

> But fame ne'er heals, still rankles worse and worse;
> Such is of uncontrollèd lust the curse.
> Think what it is in lawless sheets to lie;
> But, O Ferneze, what in lust to die!
> Then thou that shame respect'st, O, fly converse
> With women's eyes and lisping wantonness![1]

In such castigation of lust, as shown in his eagerness for direct attack designed to awaken no emotion more salutary than mere vexation, and in his blacker cynicism, Malevole is quite unlike Jaques. If the former is a good representative of a type of melancholy person called "malcontent," Shakespeare's character has departed widely from the norm.

G. B. Harrison, in a recent popular essay,[2] assumes the existence of a type of melancholy Elizabethan known as "malcontent" and seeks to distinguish it clearly from the other closely related melancholy types recognized by men of letters. He enumerates three kinds of melancholy which "were common during the period, sex, political and intellectual; and sufferers from all three, being humanly proud of their ailments, took care to advertise themselves."[3] Without pausing to comment upon the questionable logic which establishes these groups, by no means mutually exclusive, we may profitably examine the place occupied by Jaques in this classification. Harrison does not regard him as a malcontent, because he believes that term should apply to the political melancholic, the man "who could find no place in the social system"[4] and so became seditious. Jaques obviously could as little be of the "sex" type of melancholy man — the forlorn lover. Harrison puts him, therefore, among the intellectual, "the genuine melancholic humour. With many it was an affectation, assumed either to advertise the superior mind, or else to cover the empty head."[5] To this class Jaques belongs. "His complaint is excess of observation. He is too sensitive in a brutal world: . . . Jaques' melancholy here [in his famous 'All the world's a stage' soliloquy] arises from the fact that he, like most of the thinking men of his generation, had no definite belief in Christianity. . . . To a large extent the melan-

[1] *The Malcontent*, II, iii, 216–21 (*Works*, I, 253).

[2] Nicholas Breton, *Melancholike Humours*, ed., with an "Essay on Elizabethan Melancholy," by G. B. Harrison (London, 1929).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 61. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 64. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

choly of the age is due to an unwilling agnosticism and a morbid fear of death." [1]

Jaques, then, in Harrison's view, is not a malcontent, but an agnostic, whose morbid fear of death has cast a shadow over his entire life. Yet Harrison does not entirely dismiss the possibility that in the character Shakespeare "is laughing at the melancholic humour and that Jaques himself is a caricature, the dark patch which makes brighter the sunshine of Arden." [2]

Mr. Harrison's "intellectual" melancholic proves to be so loosely defined a type that a search for its representatives before Jaques gives little promise of results which will clarify Shakespeare's conception of his famous figure. However, an examination of various sorts of melancholy characters appearing in English literature of the last two decades of the sixteenth century will show whether or not they can be grouped according to the types which Stoll and Harrison attempt to establish.[3]

When the word "malcontent" is used to describe melancholy men, it either refers to forms of affectation in dress or it has as general a signification as the word "dissatisfied." The earliest example of its use recorded in the *New English Dictionary* is to be found in Bartholomew Young's translation of the fourth book of Guazzo's *La civil conversatione* published in 1586: "And we should also consider, that if the Ape is malecontent for want of a taile, the Asse for lacking hornes, the Moale hath most reason to bee agreeued because she hath no eies." [4] In this passage the word is used to indicate that the ape, lacking a tail, and the ass, lacking horns, are dissatisfied with their entire situation in life.

Two years later, in 1588, William Rankins, employing the word in a similar sense, makes it clear that it is of recent coinage:

> . . . these inchanted sort of people . . . Contemne their superiors bicause they are aboue them, their equals, because their insolency brooketh no equallity, and their inferiours, because their weighty mindes presseth them

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 73–74.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 75–76.

[3] Many of my examples are those which Harrison analyzes in his essay.

[4] *The ciuile Conuersation of M. Stephen Guazzo, written first in Italian, diuided into foure bookes, the first three translated out of French by G. pettie. . . . the fourth . . . now translated out of Italian into English by Barth. Young* (London, 1586), p. 201[v].

lower then their estate of it selfe doth debase them. So that they appeare now neuer content (either with what fortune hath lent them) or their estate holdeth aboue their deserte (according to the newe found name, wherein a generall price is taken) (*Malecontents.*) [1]

Puttenham, the following year, 1589, in his *The Arte of English Poesie*, uses the term in a connection which suggests that the radical discontent had turned the person into an earnest moral censor: "He that wrote the Satyr of Piers Ploughman, seemed to haue bene a malcontent of that time, and therefore bent himselfe wholy to taxe the disorders of that age, and specially the pride of the Romane Clergy, of whose fall he seemeth to be a very true Prophet." [2]

Shakespeare himself during the 1590's, when the word was fashionable, employed it a number of times, never with a more precise meaning than a "general feeling of dissatisfaction." [3] In every case, how-

[1] William Rankins, *The English Ape, The Italian imitation, the Footesteppes of Fraunce* (London, 1588), p. 8.

[2] *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589), p. 50.

[3] *3 Hen. VI*, Act IV, Sc. i, ll. 9–10:

K. Edw. Now, brother of Clarence, how like you our choice,
That you stand pensive, as half malcontent?

Ibid., ll. 59–60:

K. Edw. Alas, poor Clarence! is it for a wife
That thou art malcontent? I will provide thee.

Love's L. L., III, i, 182–85:

Bir.
. Dan Cupid;
Regent of love-rhymes, lord of folded arms,
The anointed sovereign of sighs and groans,
Liege of all loiterers and malcontents, . . .

Ven. and Ad., ll. 313–14:

Then, like a melancholy malcontent,
He [Adonis' stallion] vails his tail . . .

Two Gent., II, i, 17–20:

Val. Why, how know you that I am in love?
Speed. Marry, by these special marks: first, you have learn'd, like Sir Proteus, to wreathe your arms like a malcontent; . . .

M. Wives, I, iii, 109–14:

Nym. My humour shall not cool. I will incense Page to deal with poison; I will possess him with yellowness, for the revolt of mine is dangerous. That is my true humour.
Pist. Thou art the Mars of malcontents. I second thee; troop on.

(The Shakespearean quotations in this article are from *The Complete Dramatic and Poetic Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. W. A. Neilson ["Cambridge Edition"; Boston and New York, 1906].)

ever, he expects it to have a ludicrous connotation, as though it had become a cant term, likely to produce laughter in its own right.

Uses of the word similar to those of Shakespeare began to become conventional. It came to be applied to affectations of manner or of apparel. For example, Greene presents himself in *The Repentance of Robert Greene* as thrown into a deep and permanent boredom by the wild, unsettled life that he lived after leaving Cambridge. He traveled in Italy and Spain, where he "sawe and practizde such villainie as is abhominable to declare." "At my return into England," he relates, "I ruffeled out in my silks, in the habit of *Malcontent*, and seemed so discontent, that no place would please me to abide in, nor no vocation cause mee to stay my selfe in."[1] His scorn for England, real or affected, after his life on the Continent and the resulting moroseness and dissatisfaction with everything at home, were symptoms of a melancholy with which the dissolute traveler abroad was often afflicted. But only his costume, not his state of mind, is described by the adjective "malcontent."

Nashe, in *Pierce Penilesse* (1592), describes an upstart who despises England and her customs for the same ostensible reason as did Greene. But he only pretends to have traveled widely, having really been no farther away from home than Dieppe. However, it is part of his affectation to regard civilization in England as barbarous compared to what he has seen abroad, and that notion fills him with melancholy:

> All malcontent sits the greasie son of a Cloathier, & complaines (like a decaied Earle) of the ruine of ancient houses: . . . Hee will bee humorous, forsoth, and haue a broode of fashions by himselfe. . . . Hee will despise the barbarisme of his own Coũtrey, & tel a whole Legend of lyes of his trauailes vnto *Constantinople*. . . . You shall see a dapper Iacke, that hath been but ouer at *Deepe*, wring his face round about, as a man would stir vp a mustard pot, & talke English through ŷ teeth, like *Iaques Scabd-hams*, or *Monsieur Mingo de Moustrap*.[2]

This fellow is a gull, feigning the fashionable discontent adopted by the real traveler. In his case, too, the term malcontent is applied to studied attitudes of woe, not to melancholy itself.

[1] *The Repentance of Robert Greene*, ed. G. B. Harrison ("Bodley Head Quartos," No. VI; London, 1923), p. 20.

[2] *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, I (London, 1904), 168–69.

The counterfeit politician whom Nashe depicts in *Pierce Penilesse*, among those exhibiting the sins of pride, has an equally fundamental quarrel with life. His scornful melancholy has been caused by the failure of the Commonwealth to recognize and employ the political genius which he fancies he possesses:

> Some thinke to be counted rare Politicians and Statesmen, by being solitary: as who would say, I am a wise man, a braue man, . . . and there is no man worthy of my companie or friendship: when, although he goes vngartred like a malecontent Cutpursse, . . . yet cannot his stabing dagger, or his nittie loue-lock, keep him out of the legend of fantastical cockscombs. . . . Is it not a pitiful thing that a fellow that eates not a good meales meat in a weeke, . . . should take vppe a scornfull melancholy in his gate and countenance, and talke as though our common welth were but a mockery of gouernment, and our Maiestrates fooles, who wronged him in not looking into his deserts, not imploying him in State matters.[1]

Here again "malcontent" signifies merely a method of showing studied neglect of costume. By the time that Sir John Harington uses the word in *The Metamorphosis of Aiax* (1596), he applies it very clearly to a man's affected and ridiculous neglect of his personal appearance. This is apparently the first manifestation of Ajax' madness, which later expressed itself in his indiscriminate slaughter of "all the horned beasts he met":

> . . . falling to bate with Vlisses, & receiuing so fowle a disgrace of him, to be called foole afore company, and being bound to the peace, that he might not fight with so great a Counseller; he could indure it no longer, but became a perfit mal-content, viz. his hat without a band, his hose without garters, his wast without a girdle, his bootes without spurs, his purse without coine, his head without wit, and thus swearing he would kill & slay; first he killed all the horned beasts he met.[2]

Finally, about the time that Shakespeare was fashioning Jaques, Nicholas Breton writes, as one of the poems in his collection called *Melancholike humours*, a lyric called "Malcontent." Like all of the poems in the volume, it expresses a mood of vague and causeless grief.

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 169–70.

[2] *A New Discovrse of a Stale Svbiect, Called the Metamorphosis of Aiax* (London, 1596). "The Prologve to the Reader of the Metamorphosis of Aiax," sig. A 8[r].

Breton asks why he, who has sought through his life only to serve the better impulses of his nature, should find himself woebegone. And he answers:

> Ah wretched soule, why dost thou murmur so?
> It is thy crosse, and thou art borne to beare it:
> Through hellish griefs, thy hart to heauen must go,
> For patience crowne, if thou wilt liue to wear it.[1]

This mood of pious acceptance of undeserved woe, as a natural preparation for heaven, introduces a malcontent of an utterly different nature from those who have hitherto appeared in these pages.

These examples establish one fact beyond doubt — that the Elizabethans recognized no "malcontent type" and that to define Jaques by putting him into a class of characters so denominated throws no light upon Shakespeare's conception, either of his nature or of his dramatic function. Nor does Harrison's attempt to establish him as a type of intellectual made melancholy by the introverted activity of a superior intellect, prove more successful.

II

Jaques would much more easily be recognized as a type by an Elizabethan audience if he were presented as suffering from one of the carefully differentiated forms of melancholy described in the medical treatises of the age. The main tenets of the theory of humors, in which melancholy played the most prominent part, are too well known to require explanation here. However, in most of the modern expositions of the subject, the important place given to those forms of melancholy caused by the so-called adustion or burning of each one of the four humors has been neglected.[2] Yet this conception was axiomatic in every treatment of the subject. It is simply expressed in Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Castel of Helthe* (1539):

[1] *Melancholike humours, in verses of diuerse natures, set downe by Nich: Breton, Gent.* (London, 1600), sig. B 2[r].

[2] The best modern treatment of the subject is that found in Miss Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion* (Cambridge, 1930), especially Chap. VI, pp. 73–78. To this exposition my brief explanation is greatly indebted.

Melancolye is of two sortes, the one is called naturall, whiche is onelye colde and drye, the other is callyd aduste or bourned. Naturall melancolye is [(]as Galene saythe) the resydence or dregges of the bloud: and therfore is colder and thycker than the bloude. Melancoly aduste is in foure kyndes, eyther it is of naturall melancoly adust, or of the more pure parte of the bloudde aduste, or of choler adust, or of salt fleume adust.[1]

The authorities insisted that a careful distinction between the various sorts of melancholy be preserved, so that distinctly different types of individuals would not be confused. The great French physician and anatomist, Andreas Laurentius, stresses this point:

All such as wee call melancholike men, are not infected with this miserable passion which wee call melancholie: there are melancholike constitutions, which keep within the bounds and limits of health, which if we credit ancient writers, are very large and wide. We must therefore for the orderly handling of this matter, set downe all the sorts and differences of melancholike persons, to the end that the likenes of names may not trouble vs in the sequele of this discourse.[2]

It may be that the fine distinctions between the various sorts of melancholy were recognized only by physicians. Men of letters might have been acquainted with merely the most prominent and picturesque symptoms of the general disease, without knowing precisely which form they characterized. Therefore, a melancholy man in a work of fiction might exhibit a combination of peculiarities that, from the medical point of view, would be quite impossible. However, there is reason to believe that Shakespeare, at least, possessed more than an uninformed layman's knowledge of the subject. The convincing evidence that Miss Lily B. Campbell has presented to prove that Hamlet is an accurately conceived type of the sanguine adust temperament [3] makes it probable that by 1600 Shakespeare was familiar with the standard scientific analyses of melancholy. Hence, it should

[1] *The Castel of Helthe, Gathered, and made by syr Thomas Elyot knight, out of the chief authors of Phisyke, . . .* (London, 1539), sigs. T ii^{v}–T iii^{r}.

[2] *A Discovrse of the Preservation of the Sight: of Melancholike diseases; of Rheumes, and of Old age. Composed by M. Andreas Laurentius, . . . Translated out of French into English, . . . by Richard Svrphlet, Practitioner in Phisicke* (London, 1599), p. 84.

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 110–13.

not prove wasted labor to discover whether Jaques is a figure drawn closely upon a scientifically accurate model.

Natural melancholy — that produced by a considerable excess of this humor — was commonly called "ass-like melancholy" and rendered its victim, above all, sluggish. Laurentius writes: "The first sort which is grosse and earthie, maketh men altogether grosse and slacke in all their actions both of bodie and minde, fearefull, sluggish, and without vnderstanding." [1] This natural melancholy, according to Huarte's *Examen de Ingenios*, "serues not of any value for the wit, but maketh men blockish, sluggards, and grynnars." [2] And Burton describes the state into which a man is thrown by the superfluity of this humor as "cold, heavy, dull, solitary, sluggish." [3] If the melancholy grows still more abundant, it renders the patient pathological. He then becomes prone to terror, especially to that which is stimulated by "depraued conceite" and "phantasticall apparitions." [4] Jaques displays none of the symptoms characteristic of either the man who by nature is predominantly melancholy or of the sufferer who is so overburdened with his humor as to exhibit unmistakable signs of mental pathology. He is clearly not suffering from any form of so-called "Natural Melancholy."

To understand the second, or unnatural, sort of melancholy — that produced by adustion — one must remember that, ideally, the humors were supposed not only to preserve an equilibrium among themselves, but also, as expressions of the vital moisture, to maintain, severally and collectively, a properly balanced relationship to natural physiological heat. When any humor was subjected to excessive heat, it became transformed into an unnatural humor called phlegm-, choler-, melancholy-, or blood-adust, as the case might be. Moreover, all of these states were regarded as forms of melancholy and frequently called by the general term "choler adust," as a short equivalent of the phrase "melancholy formed by adustion."

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 85–86.

[2] *Examen de Ingenios. The Examination of mens Wits. . . . Translated out of the Spanish tongue by M. Camillo Camilli. Englished out of his Italian, by R. C*[*arew*] (London, 1594), p. 85. (Quoted by Lily B. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 76.)

[3] *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. A. R. Shilleto (London, 1896), I, 458.

[4] Timothy Bright, *A Treatise of Melancholie* (London, 1586), p. 103.

Timothy Bright, in Chapter XVIII of *A Treatise of Melancholie*, gives perhaps the clearest explanation of these phenomena arising from adustion that is to be found in English medical theory before Shakespeare's time:[1]

> Besides the former kindes, there are sortes of vnnaturall melancholie: . . . these are of another nature farre disagreeing from the other, & by an vnproper speech called melancholy. They rise of the naturall humors, or their excrements by excessiue distemper of heate, burned as it were into ashes in comparison of humour, by which the humour of like nature being mixed, turneth it into a sharp lye: sanguine, cholericke, or melancholicke, according to the humour thus burned, which we call by name of melancholie.[2]

Bright, it will be remarked, limits the forms of adustion to three, assuming that there could be no adustion of phlegm. However, Newton, in his translation of the Latin work of Levinus Lemnius, under the title *The Touchstone of Complexions*,[3] enumerates all four sorts of adustion, as does Sir Thomas Elyot. Burton also has room in his capacious system for the four kinds. Certain symptoms seem to have been common to all these forms of melancholy caused by adustion. In the first place, those afflicted are always variable and emotionally unreliable, veering from one extreme of feeling to another. In particular, they pass quickly from grief to mirth, from weeping to laughter.[4] The authorities apparently thought of the heat which caused adustion as waxing and waning like a fire and producing these abrupt changes in temperament through the fluctuations in vital temperature.[5]

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 110–16. The title of the chapter is, "Of the vnnaturall melancholie rising by adustion, how it affecteth vs with diuers passions."

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[3] *The Touchstone of Complexions. . . . Fyrst wrytten in Latine, by Leuine Lemnie, and now Englished by Thomas Newton. Nosce teipsum* (London, 1581).

[4] "And hereupon, in a maner all at one instant & without any time betwixt, do wee see them sodeinly chaunged from laughter & myrth, into sorrow & pensiuenes." (*Ibid.*, p. 148.) The title of Bright's Chap. XXVIII (*op. cit.*, pp. 161–66) is "Howe melancholie causeth both weeping and laughing, and the reasons how."

[5] "*Aristotle* declareth . . . Melancholike men are variable and vnequall: for the force of choler adust [meaning here any form of melancholy which has been produced by adustion] is variable and vnequall; as if the same might be greatly both hot and cold, & as if he had said, Melancholike men by adustion are variable and vnequall in their complexion: for that choler

Sufferers from any form of unnatural melancholy, Bright asserts, have active minds and display wit.[1] Though they are usually weak in memory, they possess just that mixture of understanding and imagination which makes them prone to figurative and sententious utterance.[2]

Such a state as this is produced by only a moderate degree of adustion. When the burning of any one of the humors has proceeded to greater extremes, the mental states are more like actual madness. Langton presents this theory clearly and simply:

> Melancholye or blacke choler, is made vnnaturalle, whan other humoures, or elles it selfe, is burned as drye as asshes. . . . And hereof commeth so manye kyndes of madnesse. For yf Melancholy, be delayed wyth a lytle blood, it maketh a manne merye madde, yf it be mixte wyth a great deale of red choler, than it maketh hym starke woode, as Hercules & Aiax was. By yf it be mixte with flegme it maketh hym slothfull wythout all meane or measure.
>
> If melancholye it selfe, wythout the admixtion of other humours be burned, than it maketh hym sad and solitarye, as Bellerophon, whyche . . . forsoke all companye, and wandered in desolate feyldes solitarye al alone.[3]

Jaques' prevailing humor obviously has not been burned so deeply as to reduce it to any form of madness. But he does exhibit the emotional variability characteristic of the moderately adust temperament. He takes equal delight in weeping over the hunted deer and in laughing at Touchstone's sallies. Yet he is enough master of his mind to enlist his volatile powers of intelligence and imagination in the serv-

adust is verie vnequall, inasmuch as somtimes it is exceeding hot, and somtimes cold beyond measure." (Huarte, *op. cit.*, p. 147.)

[1] "Sometime it falleth out, that melancholie men are found verie wittie, and quickly discerne: either because the humour of melancholie with some heate is so made subtile, that as from the driest woode riseth the clearest flame, . . . in like sort their spirits, both from the drinesse of the matter, and straining of the grosse substance from which they passe, receauing a purenesse, are instrumentes of such sharpnesse: which is the drie light that Heraclitus approued. To this, other reasons may be added: as exercise of their wittes, wherein they be indefatigable." (*Op. cit.*, p. 130.)

[2] ". . . for although memorie faile them [those made melancholy through adustion], they enioy of themselues such inuention that the verie imagination serueth them in stead of memorie and remembrance; and ministreth vnto them figures and sentences to deliuer, without that they stand in need of ought besides." (Huarte, *op. cit.*, p. 146.)

[3] *An introduction into phisycke, wyth an vniuersal dyet, gathered by Christofer Langton* (London [1550]), fols. xlv–xlvi.

ice of his figurative sententiousness. These are the most prominent features of his character, and of all types of the unnaturally melancholy.

The initial description of Jaques, developed with more than ordinary fulness and circumstance, suggests that Shakespeare wishes his audience to regard his eccentric as a representative of one specific form of adustion. He is introduced to us as lying

> Under an oak whose antique root peeps out
> Upon the brook that brawls along this wood;

and allowing the wounded deer to stimulate him to such sentimental reflection that the Lords leave him

> weeping and commenting
> Upon the sobbing deer.[1]

This report would suggest to anyone who possessed the most elementary knowledge of the humors that Jaques was a phlegmatic person of some sort. Being a cold and moist humor, phlegm was associated in everyone's mind with water. The phlegmatic were attracted to water in both their waking and dreaming hours. Laurentius writes: "... as the phlegmatike partie dreameth commonly of riuers of water, and the cholerike of flaming fire: so the melancholike person dreameth of nothing but dead men, graues, and all other such mournfull and vnpleasant things." [2]

Lemnius mentions the same phenomenon: "... they that be of Cold and moist Complexion, in Dreames imagine and thyncke themselues dyvinge ouer head and eares in water, or to be in Bathes and Baynes." [3] Burton, in summing up the characteristics of the phlegmatic adust type, says: "... *they are much given to weeping, and delight in waters, ponds, pools, rivers,* ... they are ... *much troubled with heade-ache,* continual meditation, and muttering to themselves; they dream of waters." [4] A character who was introduced to an Elizabethan audience poring over a brook and there weeping and meditating, would write himself down at once as a phlegmatic person who had been rendered melancholy.

[1] *As You Like It,* II, i, 31–32, 65–66.
[2] *Op. cit.,* p. 95. [3] *Op. cit.,* p. 112[v]. [4] *Op. cit.,* I, 459.

Jaques, then, was presented at first in a way which would inevitably suggest to an Elizabethan audience a man of natural phlegmatic temperament. Some of his original sluggishness appears in his aversion to practical life and to all forms of useful activity. Yet his phlegm, through his licentious life, has been heated to a temperature at which the brain is stimulated to ingenious exercise of the imagination. Abstention from action gives him leisure for incessant meditation upon the ways of man. The unnaturally produced melancholy renders him incapable of being delighted by anything that he sees and hears. Instead, all life seems to be a manifestation of folly and futility. Finally, his particular form of burnt phlegm has heated his mind to a temperature at which it is automatically stimulated to sententious comment upon ridiculous aspects of life — in other words, he moralizes every spectacle. These characteristics would be immediately recognized by intelligent Elizabethans as the identifying marks of a familiar type of mildly abnormal individual. They would have realized at once that his was the unnatural melancholy produced by the adustion of phlegm.

III

Whatever insight our examination may have given us into the essential character of Jaques will be of importance largely as it facilitates understanding of his dramatic function. Representing no figure in Lodge's novel of which the play is a dramatization, Jaques renders no service to the plot. His entertainment is offered in interludes to the story, and the critics agree that it is a form of satire. Yet it is a moot question whether the author's shafts of ridicule are aimed against Jaques or whether he serves as the mouthpiece for Shakespeare's own satiric comment. Light may be thrown upon this question by examining the dramatic function of typical humorous melancholiacs who appeared in some of the comedies written shortly before *As You Like It* was produced.

One of the first of these is Dowsecer in Chapman's *An Humourous Day's Mirth*, a play initially produced on May 1, 1597.[1] He is an intelligent young lord, a scholar, who, according to his own diagnosis, given at the end of the play, has become melancholy not through

[1] E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), III, 251.

emulation or envy but through affectation dictated by intellectual pride.[1] His pose, then, is to affect contempt of the world and to express it in misanthropic comment upon life. As the King explains, his unhappy state of mind also drives him to solitude:

> *King.* Peace, Lemot; they say the young Lord Dowsecer
> Is rarely learned, and nothing lu[n]atic
> As men suppose,
> But hateth company and worldly trash.[2]

This melancholy the other characters think ridiculous. They eagerly come, as for a dramatic spectacle, to the house of Labervele, where the mischief-maker Lemot is to arrange an exhibition of Dowsecer's humor. Lemot's plan requires the placing of a picture of a lady, "*a pair of large hose, a codpiece, and a sword*" where they will catch Dowsecer's eye and so stimulate him to automatic utterance of bitter reflections. The scheme works. As soon as the melancholiac sees the sword, he begins as follows:

> *Dow.* [*seeing the sword*] See, see, the shameless world,
> That dares present her mortal enemy
> With these gross ensigns of her le[v]ity,
> Iron and steel, uncharitable stuff,
> Good spital-founders, enemies to whole skins,
> As if there were not ways enough to die
> By natural and casual accidents,
> Diseases, surfeits, brave carouses, old aqua-vitæ,
> and too base wives,
> And thousands more. Hence with this art of murder![3]

Comments in a similar vein are evoked by the other objects. But his most pessimistic utterance is made in answer to his father's suggestion that he marry:

[1] "The fire of love which she [Martia] hath kindled in me
Being greater than my heat of vanity,
Hath quite expelled [my melancholy]."
(Sc. xiv, ll. 94–96 [*The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Comedies*, ed. T. M. Parrott (London, 1914), p. 91].)

[2] *Ibid.*, Sc. vii, ll. 15–18 (*The Comedies*, p. 67).

[3] *Ibid.*, ll. 91–99 (*The Comedies*, p. 69).

Dow. To marry, father? Why, we shall have children.
Lab. Why, that's the end of marriage, and the joy of men.
Dow. Oh, how you are deceived! You have but me,
And what a trouble am I to your joy!
But, father, if you long to have some fruit of me,
See, father, I will creep into this stubborn earth
And mix my flesh with it, and they shall breed grass
To fat oxen, asses, and such-like,
And when they in the grass the spring converts
Into beasts' nourishment,
Then comes the fruit of this my body forth.[1]

With such extravagant bitterness is mingled so much penetrating wisdom that the other dramatic figures are not provoked to the expected laughter at Dowsecer's folly. One of the King's comments is, "This is no humour, this is but perfit judgment," and Martia falls in love with the young man because of her admiration of his grim philosophy. He thus appears, during this planned exhibition of his humor, as only vaguely comic. His irrational and affected bitterness too frequently crosses the line into sound satire. Yet he is purged of his melancholy. He falls in love with Martia at first sight and, hearing that she is held a prisoner to the king's amours, he sets out to rescue her. The action he takes to accomplish that result completely dissipates his melancholy. This fact shows that Chapman considered Dowsecer's philosophical pessimism, if not a pose, at least abnormal — a disease to be cured.

The comic possibilities of his irrepressibly misanthropic comment are more fully realized in a scene in which Labesha is made unconsciously to burlesque these typical soliloquies. In the manner of a gull considering the melancholy of Dowsecer an infallible sign of a gentleman, he imitates it to its last detail. Catalian explains the situation:

Cat. Why, man, Labesha is grown marvellous malcontent upon some amorous disposition of his mistress, and you know he loves a mess of cream and a spice-cake with his heart, and I am sure he hath not dined to day, and he hath taken on him the humour of the young Lord Dowsecer, and we will set a mess of cream, a spice-cake, and a spoon, as the armour, picture, and

[1] *Ibid.*, ll. 169–79 (*The Comedies*, p. 71).

apparel was set in the way of Dowsecer, which I doubt not but will work a rare cure upon his melancholy. [1]

The trap is set. Labesha begins, as Catalian had prophesied, "with some Latin sentence that he hath remembered ever since he read his accidence" and proceeds to his ridiculous equivalent of Dowsecer's soliloquies:

Labes. Oh, cruel Fortune, and dost thou spit thy spite at my poor life? But oh, sour cream, what thinkest thou that I love thee still? No, no, fair and sweet is my mistress! If thou haddest strawberries and sugar in thee — but it may be thou art set with stale cake to choke me. Well, taste it, and try it, spoonful by spoonful — bitterer and bitterer still! But oh, sour cream, wert thou an onion, since Fortune set thee for me, I will eat thee, and I will devour thee in spite of Fortune's spite.[2]

This burlesque by Labesha, whose affectation of melancholy is described as malcontent, is ridiculous in itself and confirms the view that Dowsecer is presented satirically.[3]

The gull who feigns melancholy because he considers the mood one of the distinguishing marks of a gentleman, cuts a ridiculous figure in Ben Jonson's first humor-play. In *Every Man in His Humor* Stephano, the country gull, declares to his cousin, who mocks him by urging him to portray more adequately the idea of what he is in his aspect:

Marry . . . I will be more melancholie, and gentlemanlike then I haue beene, I doe ensure you.[4]

[1] *Ibid.*, Sc. xii, ll. 19–27 (*The Comedies*, p. 85).

[2] *Ibid.*, ll. 42–50 (*The Comedies*, p. 86).

[3] Emil Koeppel has suggested that Dowsecer reflects the mood of Hamlet in the pre-Shakespearean play known as the *Ur-Hamlet*. (*Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's* [*Quellen und Forschungen*, Heft LXXXII; Strassburg, 1897], p. 3.) Although the two characters clearly belong to the same type, no such direct relationship between them need be assumed. Dowsecer is merely an intellectual young man whose abnormal melancholy expresses itself in misanthropic philosophizing. He serves both as an object and instrument of satire in this first comedy of humors.

[4] Act I, Sc. ii, ll. 113–15 (*Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, III [Oxford, 1927], 206). I quote from the quarto text for the obvious reason that the revision which resulted in the more familiar folio text was certainly not undertaken until after *As You Like It* had been written and produced.

Later he and the city gull, Matheo, vie with each other in praise of this fashionable melancholy:

Step. I truely sir, I am mightily giuen to melancholy.

Mat. Oh Lord sir, it's your only best humor sir, your true melancholy, breedes your perfect fine wit sir: I am melancholie my selfe diuers times sir, and then do I no more but take your pen and paper presently, and write you your halfe score or your dozen of sonnets at a sitting.

.

Step. Truely sir, and I loue such things out of measure.

.

Cousin, is it well? am I melancholie inough?

Lo.iu. Oh I, excellent.

Prosp. Signior *Bobadilla*? why muse you so?

Lo.iu. He is melancholy too.[1]

These ridiculous apes of gentility affect, as a necessary social grace, a melancholy which they do not feel, and represent Ben Jonson's first experiments with the comic possibilities of feigned melancholy.

At least one other melancholy critic appears in English drama just before Jaques comes upon the scene. This is Feliche, an honest, plain-spoken fellow — a character in the First Part of *Antonio and Mellida* (1599). G. B. Harrison calls him a "contented malcontent," [2] because, though sharply critical of social folly, he is satisfied with his own modest lot, remote from court. His critical view is not stimulated by malice; but it is no less keen nor his comment less penetrating for that reason:

> [I] from the height of contemplation,
> Have view'd the feeble joints men totter on.
> I envy none; but hate, or pity all.[3]

Feliche's own description of his "humour," given in the Prologue, is to exactly the same effect. Mr. Morse Allen says:

In this play Feliche is the author's representative. He is the honest courtier who befriends the hero and exposes foolishness, and whose philosophy is the one current about 1600, stoicism. He is described at some length in the

[1] II, iii, 76–97 (*Jonson*, III, 228).
[2] Breton, *Melancholike Humours*, ed. Harrison, p. 82.
[3] John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida*, First Part, III, ii, 45–47 (*Works*, I, 51).

Induction, as possessing the true stoic content — he never thinks any man perfect, either in nature or fortune, consequently he is fitted to judge the world justly, without favoritism because without envy. This is of course Marston's real attitude throughout the satires, though it is never expressed there so clearly.[1]

Mr. Allen is right in pointing out that Feliche is a figure invented to perform in drama the function assumed by the author himself in formal satire. Most of Feliche's comments are thus either expressions of ethical wisdom or explanations that, as exhibitor of the fools, he must make. But, on occasions, the folly of what he beholds drives him to deep disgust with the entire world. Then his soliloquies become utterances of profound misanthropy. After Balurdo the gull has rubbed out with his slipper some of Rossaline's spittle ejaculated for the purpose, he says, "You grace my shoe with an unmeasured honour: I will preserve the sole of it, as a most sacred relic for this service." The idiocy of Balurdo in this scene induces in Feliche a fit of deep meditation. When Rossaline breaks it with "But, good Feliche, why art thou so sad," he presently replies:

> O that the stomach of this queasy age
> Digests, or brooks such raw unseasoned gobs,
> And vomits not them forth! O! slavish sots!
> Servant, quoth you? faugh! if a dog should crave
> And beg her service, he should have it straight:
> She'd give him favours too, to lick her feet,
> Or fetch her fan, or some such drudgery.[2]

Even in a passage of this sort Feliche is principally the instrument, rather than the object, of satire. Yet the extravagance of his utterance approaches grotesqueness, which renders him faintly ridiculous.

This brief survey has shown that in the dramas written just before *As You Like It* two sorts of melancholy figures appeared. One was the preposterous gull or social would-be, who affected melancholy because he regarded it as almost the essential quality of an Elizabethan gentleman. The other was the man of native intellectual power, the equilibrium of whose mental constitution has been upset by too great an infusion of the humor of melancholy into his system. The

[1] Morse S. Allen, *The Satire of John Marston* (Columbus, O., 1920), p. 129.
[2] *Antonio and Mellida*, First Part, II, i, 94–100 (*Works*, I, 33).

consequence is an accentuation of his critical attitude toward the social world in which he lives. All his utterances thus take inevitably some form of satire. Certain of his speeches are just enough restrained to gain our assent and to induce us to adopt his hostile point of view. Others are so clearly the product of his jaundiced eye that their exaggerations make him absurd. This second type of melancholy man performs a twofold comic service: he is at once the agent and the object of the writer's satire.

Jaques belongs, I believe, to this second class of humorous melancholics. That he is an abnormal type, defined and universally recognized by Renaissance experts in internal medicine, establishes this fact. He, too, serves the double satiric purpose. Through the invasion of melancholy, his native intellectual keenness has been put into the service of a misanthropic spirit. His insight enables him to ferret out hidden abuses in society and absurdities in personality; his pessimism impels him to comment on his discoveries with bitterness, often so overdrawn as to become ludicrous. His dramatic function can thus be said to be wholly satiric — a fact which renders him important as marking the first clear effort on the part of Shakespeare to employ some of the devices that had appeared in the recently initiated satiric drama.

Jaques is introduced to the audience not only as a phlegmatic person afflicted with unnatural melancholy, but also as a figure to be laughed at. The Duke immediately recognizes possibilities of entertainment in a fellow who is automatically stimulated by a wounded deer to pessimistic generalities delivered to the vacant air. He longs to encounter him when he is in one of these sullen fits, for then he furnishes him with rich food for laughter. To transform a character thus introduced into a mouthpiece of the author's philosophy later in the play, would be to confuse an audience in a way that Shakespeare, the practical dramatist, would unquestionably have avoided.

Though Jaques' melancholy had its origin in his disordered temperament, he is enough of an egoist to regard it as a form of personal distinction. He certainly warms to self-analysis in the familiar explanation of his emotional nature given to Rosalind:

> I have neither the scholar's melancholy, which is emulation; nor the musician's, which is fantastical; nor the courtier's, which is proud; . . . but it is a

melancholy of mine own, compounded of many simples, extracted from many objects; and indeed the sundry contemplation of my travels, in which my often rumination wraps me in a most humorous sadness.[1]

The last phrase of this confession places Jaques among the real or pretended travelers into foreign lands, whose boredom upon their return to England expresses itself in general dissatisfacton and cynicism. Certain of these fellows have appeared during the course of our examination of the term "malcontent." A more thorough representative of the type appears in Bruto, a figure in Marston's second satire, written no later than 1578. He has returned from a sojourn on the Continent to view life in England with a jaundiced eye:

> Look, look, with what a discontented grace
> Bruto the traveller doth sadly pace
> 'Long Westminster!
>
> And now he sighs: "O thou corrupted age,
> Which slight regard'st men of sound carriage!
> Virtue, knowledge, fly to heaven again;
> Deign not 'mong these ungrateful sots remain!
> Well, some tongues I know, some countries I have seen,
> And yet these oily snails respectless been
> Of my good parts." [2]

This description makes it clear that it is neglect and injured pride which have provoked his railing against the "corrupted age." Marston in his role of corrector turns upon Bruto, accusing him of having been a libertine abroad and of having brought home only new forms of dissipation and their evil results:

> O worthless puffy slave!
> Didst thou to Venice go ought else to have,
> But buy a lute and use a courtesan,
>
> Well, then, exclaim not on our age, good man,
> But hence, polluted Neapolitan.[3]

[1] *A. Y. L.*, IV, i, 10–20.
[2] *Satire II*, ll. 127–29, 133–39 (*Works*, III, 274).
[3] *Ibid.*, ll. 139–41, 155–56 (*ibid.*, pp. 274–75).

Rosalind directs the audience similarly to regard Jaques' travels as the cause of his melancholy, when she flings this comment at him on one of his exits:

> Farewell, Monsieur Traveller. Look you lisp and wear strange suits, disable all the benefits of your own country, be out of love with your nativity, and almost chide God for making you that countenance you are, or I will scarce think you have swam in a gondola.[1]

The Duke earlier in the play attacks Jaques' libertinism, as Marston did that of Bruto, and likwise considers it an unworthy stimulus to satire:

> Most mischievous foul sin, in chiding sin.
> For thou thyself hast been a libertine,
> As sensual as the brutish sting itself;
> And all the embossed sores and headed evils,
> That thou with license of free foot hast caught,
> Wouldst thou disgorge into the general world.[2]

It will be remembered that Burton lists, as one of the causes of melancholy, immoderate pleasure or libertinism:

> As the prodigal son had exquisite musick, merry company, dainty fare at first, but a sorrowful reckoning in the end; so have all such vain delights and their followers. *Tristes voluptatum exitus, ut quisquis voluptatum suarum reminisci volet, intelliget,* as bitter as gall & wormwood is their last; grief of mind, madness itself.[3]

One of the moral dangers which the Elizabethans saw in continental travel, particularly in Italy, was that of sexual indulgence, a vice that seems, at all stages of history, to wear an Englishman into a state of settled low spirits. This cynicism of an exhausted roué is stigmatized by both Marston and Shakespeare as a completely unsound source of moral correction. In fact, in Jaques' case, it has been the agent of the adustion of his phlegmatic nature, the cause of his psychosis.

However induced, Jacques' irresistible impulse to moralize every spectacle continues to be presented as food for laughter. He wishes all those he meets to join with him in a chorus of misanthropic comment.

[1] *A. Y. L.*, IV, i, 32–37.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, vii, 64–69.
[3] *Op. cit.*, I, 333.

He invites Orlando to share in his railing against "our mistress the world, and all our misery." But the lover repels him with an answer that would deprive every satirist of his office: "I will chide no breather in the world but myself, against whom I know most faults." And Jaques' "lungs began to crow like a chanticleer," when he heard Touchstone comment, in imitation of his approved manner, on the simple fact that it was ten o'clock. Jaques thus reports the event:

> And then he drew a dial from his poke,
> And, looking on it with lack-lustre eye,
> Says very wisely, "It is ten o'clock.
> Thus we may see," quoth he, "how the world wags.
> 'T is but an hour ago since it was nine;
> And after one hour more 't will be eleven;
> And so, from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,
> And then, from hour to hour, we rot and rot; . . ."[1]

If Jaques had realized that Touchstone's soliloquy was a parody of his own, as those of Labesha were ridiculous imitations of Dowsecer, he might have seen his humor as the folly it appears to be to the audience.

IV

Jaques, then, during most of the play is a satirically drawn portrait of a familiar dramatic type. He is, to be sure, comic without ever becoming downright ridiculous. His abstention from any form of grotesque folly enables him on occasions to be, like Dowsecer and Feliche, an agent of satire. Indeed, he serves as an amusing representative of the English satirists who wrote from 1590 to 1600, so that we find him enunciating some of the critical doctrines which, by 1600, they had made official for the group.

These authors justified the critical freedom which they assumed by insisting that all their attacks were strictly impersonal. In one of the poems which inaugurated the movement, Sir John Davies' *Epigrams*,[2] the author explicitly disavows writing lampoons:

[1] *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 20–27.

[2] These poems were published, along with some elegies of Marlowe, as early as 1596, under the title *Epigrammes and Elegies. By I. D. and C. M.* The works, however, were in circulation by 1592–93.

But if thou find any so grosse and dull,
That thinke I do to priuate taxing leane,
Bid him go hang, for he is but a gull,
And knowes not what an Epigramme doth meane:
Which taxeth vnder a particular name,
A generall vice that merites publike blame.[1]

Marston, in his prose epilogue to *The Scourge of Villainy*, makes the same sort of denial:

Yet, I fear me, I shall be much, much injuried by two sorts of readers: the one being ignorant, not knowing the nature of a satire (which is, under feigned private names to note general vices), will needs wrest each feigned name to a private unfeigned person: the other, too subtile, bearing a private malice to some greater personage than he dare, in his own person, seem to malign, will strive, by a forced application of my general reproofs, to broach his private hatred, — than the which I know not a greater injury can be offered to a satirist. I durst presume, knew they how guiltless and how free I were from prying into privateness, they would blush to think how much they wrong themselves in seeking to injure me. Let this protestation satisfy our curious searchers; so may I obtain my best hopes, as I am free from endeavouring to blast any private man's good name. If any one (forced with his own guilt) will turn it home and say, " 'Tis I," I cannot hinder him; neither do I injure him.[2]

At the end of Act II of *Every Man out of His Humour*, Cordatus advances a similar defense in the name of his creator, Ben Jonson. He suggests that perhaps Mitis thinks that no citizen will relish his picture of the merchant who dotes on his wife. But that, he adds, would be as foolish as for a true courtier to take offense at the character of Fastidious Briske. He assures Mitis that no grave, wise citizen or modest matron will

take the obiect of this folly in DELIRO, and his wife: but rather apply it as the foile to their owne vertues. For that were to affirme, that a man, writing of NERO, should meane all Emperors: or speaking of MACHIAVEL, comprehend all States-men; or in our SORDIDO, all Farmars; and so of the rest: then which, nothing can be vtter'd more malicious, or absurd. [3]

[1] *Ibid.*, sig. A 3[r].
[2] *Works*, III, 381–82.
[3] Sc. vi, ll. 164–70 (*Jonson*, III, 494–95).

In the following familiar soliloquy, Jaques claims membership in this school of satirists:

> Why, who cries out on pride,
> That can therein tax any private party?
> Doth it not flow as hugely as the sea,
> Till that the wearer's very means do ebb?
> What woman in the city do I name,
> When that I say the city-woman bears
> The cost of princes on unworthy shoulders?
> Who can come in and say that I mean her,
> When such a one as she such is her neighbour?
> Or what is he of basest function,
> That says his bravery is not on my cost,
> Thinking that I mean him, but therein suits
> His folly to the mettle of my speech?
> There then; how then? what then? Let me see wherein
> My tongue hath wrong'd him. If it do him right,
> Then he hath wrong'd himself. If he be free,
> Why then my taxing like a wild-goose flies,
> Unclaim'd of any man.[1]

Jaques, furthermore, in his expressions of zeal for purging the world of its foulness, echoes the satirists who preceded him. The clearest statement of his purpose is to be read in the following lines:

> Give me leave
> To speak my mind, and I will through and through
> Cleanse the foul body of the infected world,
> If they will patiently receive my medicine.[2]

This is the spirit which animates all of Marston's formal satires:

> Now, Satirè, cease to rub our gallèd skins,
> And to unmask the wòrld's detested sins;
> Thou shalt as soon draw Nilus river dry
> As cleanse the world from foul impiety.[3]

[1] *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 70–87. John D. Rea, in "Jaques in Praise of Folly," *Modern Philology*, XVII (1919–20), 465–69, believes the ideas in this soliloquy were suggested by a passage in Erasmus' *In Praise of Folly*. In view of the conventional nature of such a point of view among English satirists, this seems highly improbable.

[2] *A. Y. L.*, II, vii, 58–61.

[3] *Satire II*, ll. 157–60 (*Works*, III, 275).

> Now, grim Reproof, swell in my rough-hued rhyme,
> That thou mayst vex the guilty of our time.[1]
>
> I bear the scourge of just Rhamnusia,
> Lashing the lewdness of Britannia.
> Let others sing as their good genius moves,
> Of deep designs, or else of clipping loves:
>
> But as for me, my vexèd thoughtful soul
> Takes pleasure in displeasing sharp control.[2]

Asper's threat,

> Ile strip the ragged follies of the time,
> Naked, as at their birth,[3]

is another declaration of satiric principle which Jaques clearly echoes.

These resemblances between the program of Jaques and that of the English satirists whose work had just appeared, have led some critics to believe that in him Shakespeare lampoons one individual among contemporary practitioners of this art. For example, G. B. Harrison makes an ingenious attempt to connect him with Sir John Harington. In his "Prologve" to *The Metamorphosis of Aiax*, it will be remembered, Sir John traces the word "a Iakes," the privy, to "this noble Captaine of the greasie ones (the Grecians I should say) AIAX."[4] Harrison, among others, suggests that Jaques' name comes from this double source. He writes:

> It comes by an underground, not to say cloacal, channel from Sir John Harrington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596). . . . But there is another connection between Ajax and a jakes [other than similarity in pronunciation]; both are melancholy, like the 'melancholy of Moorditch' and such unsavoury similes. Now Ajax is the classic type of the Melancholick Humour.[5]

It is possible that Jaques' name originated thus, but even if so the knowledge throws no light upon the nature of his satiric efforts. Cer-

[1] *Satire III*, ll. 1–2 (*ibid.*, p. 276).
[2] *The Scourge of Villany*, Proemium in Librum Primum, ll. 1–4, 7–8 (*ibid.*, p. 307).
[3] *Every Man out of His Humour*, prologue, ll. 17–18 (*Jonson*, III, 428).
[4] Harington, *op. cit.*, sig. B 2[r].
[5] John Marston, *The Scourge of Villanie*, ed. G. B. Harrison ("Bodley Head Quartos," No. XIII; London, 1925), p. 125.

tainly Jaques does not resemble the portrait of Ajax which Harington draws.

Another critic, B. H. Newdigate, has convinced himself not only that Jaques owes his name to *The Metamorphosis of Aiax* but also that the character is intended to be a satiric portrait of Harington.[1] He points out the interesting fact that Sir John possessed a pocket dial, his impresa, for which were the mottoes, "Il tempo passa" and "Fin che vegna." An engraving of this dial appears in front of his portrait in the 1591 edition of the *Orlando Furioso;* hence the author would be associated with this object by many of his readers. Jaques' dial, and the clown's reflections on the flight of time which it provokes, would perhaps suggest to many Sir John himself. No other similarities that Newdigate indicates between Harington and Jaques are of much importance. It is possible that Shakespeare intended the dial to serve as a sort of topical reference to Sir John, but he can hardly have sought to make Jaques a carefully drawn satiric portrait. Surely, the melancholy courtier's soliloquies uttered in the Forest of Arden are remote from the Rabelaisian impudencies of the author of the *Metamorphosis.*

Other critics have thought that Ben Jonson was ridiculed through Jaques. Their case rests on the familiar speech given to Kempe in the second part of *The Returne from Parnassus:* "O that *Ben Ionson* is a pestilent fellow, he brought vp *Horace* giuing the Poets a pill, but our fellow *Shakespeare* hath giuen him a purge that made him beray his credit."[2] Finding neither Ajax nor Thersites apt for this service, they have considered whether the purge may not have been administered through Jaques. Herford and Simpson point out the similarity between Asper's satiric platform and one of Jaques' remarks, and judge the matter sanely:

> Possibly enough Jonson may be glanced at; but note that Shakespeare gives Jaques the last word. His vindication of satire (which is substantially Jonson's) remains unanswered (II. vii. 83–7). This was clearly no 'purge'.[3]

[1] B. H. Newdigate, in *The* [London] *Times Literary Supplement*, Jan. 3, 1929, p. 12, Jan. 10, 1929, p. 28. His view is upheld by R. T. Gunther in the issue for Jan. 17, 1929, p. 44.

[2] *The Returne from Parnassus*, Pt. 2, IV, iii, ll. 1810–13 (in *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus, with the Two Parts of The Return from Parnassus*, ed. W. D. Macray [Oxford, 1886], p. 138).

[3] *Jonson*, I (1925), 28 n.

Arthur Gray, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, later seizes upon this suggestion and seeks to prove it to be an indubitable fact.[1] His identification of the two is largely based on similarities between the privileges that Jaques claims for his satire, and statements, in Jonson's plays, which I have shown to be not peculiar to Jonson but commonplaces of the contemporary satiric movement. To be sure, Mr. Gray believes that Shakespeare is expressing his disapproval, not of Jonson as a personality, but of "the employment of satire, intended to be personal, in 'Every Man out of his Humour.'" [2]

Mr. Gray further admits that the dramatic criticism in Act II, Scene vii, of *As You Like It*, might apply as well to Marston, who was as great an offender in this direction as Jonson himself; but Shakespeare did not "waste shot on the pigmies of the theatre. Jonson, his stage-fellow and only dramatic rival, was worth a schooling." [3] G. B. Harrison explores this possibility that Jaques may owe something to Marston.[4] He compares Jaques' soliloquy in Act II, Scene i, beginning

> Why, who cries out on pride,
> That can therein tax any private party?

with the paragraph, "To him that hath perused me," at the end of Marston's *The Scourge of Villany*, and finds the expression of the identical idea in the two passages proof of a definite glance at Marston through Jaques; but, as has been shown above, both passages are expressions of a widespread convention. This similarity in satiric confession of faith, taken with Celia's reference to the burning of the satirical books on June 1, 1599,[5] convinces the critic that "It is, therefore, not improbable that Shakespeare is gently satirising his melancholy contemporary in the person of Jaques." [6] The case for Marston is, in my opinion, just about as strong as that for Jonson, but the claims of one cancel those of the other and re-establish Jaques in the more general and interesting relationship to the recently defunct formal satire and to the nascent satiric drama which this essay seeks to establish.

[1] Arthur Gray, *How Shakespeare 'Purged' Jonson: A Problem Solved* (Cambridge, 1928).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 20. [3] *Loc. cit.* [4] *The Scourge of Villanie*, ed. Harrison, pp. 124–26.
[5] "Since the little wit that fools have was silenced, the little foolery that wise men have makes a great show." (*A. Y. L.*, I, ii, 94–97.)
[6] *The Scourge of Villanie*, ed. Harrison, p. 125.

Jaques is thus no unfriendly portrait of any one satirist of the time. However, the fact that he enunciates the principles of the entire contemporary school shows that through his role Shakespeare expresses his own view of the methods of the whole movement. That opinion is unfavorable. True, Jaques' criticisms of life are not intended to provoke such scorn as that, for example, which is directed against Bruto's ill-natured complaints. Shakespeare deprecates the savage manner of both Marston and Jonson. Yet most of Jacques' satiric pronouncements are shown to be either invalid or presumptuous. His sour generalities are usually proved false by the action that follows them. He urges Orlando to "rail against our mistress the world, and all our misery," just before the lover meets Rosalind for a colloquy full of joyful excitement for both of them.

Jaques' famous soliloquy on the seven ages of man is also a characteristic utterance of the figure as we have presented him. Its extreme and all-inclusive cynicism is the distinguishing trait of his pathological melancholia, as it is of his fashionably acquired, but senescent, libertinism. However, one may admit that, once embarked upon the composition of this soliloquy, the dramatist in Shakespeare was temporarily captured by the lyric poet. Consequently, the passage possesses a verbal felicity and a poetic magic that have blinded the vision of all those critics who have insisted that these eloquent words express Shakespeare's own view of existence.

It should be noted that this speech is so placed in the scene of which it is a part as to have its tone immediately neutralized and all its assumptions as promptly contradicted. The woeful pageant of Adam's hunger and Orlando's desperate distress at his plight is transformed by the tender sympathy and ministrations of the Duke into contentment and joy. And the song of Amiens gives lyrical utterance to the metamorphoses which the Forest of Arden has effected. Bitter though the life at court may have been,

> Then, heigh-ho, the holly!
> This life is most jolly.

Thus, the temper of this play contradicts at every turn even the most beautifully turned phrases of the pessimist, who cannot and will not see the world into which he has wandered.

The Duke inevitably becomes irritated at the boasted competency of a man who is blinded by the nature of his mind "to cleanse the foul body of the infected world." Such pretension he challenges in a speech couched in a severe moral tone never elsewhere struck in this comedy. Its initial phrase, "Most mischievous foul sin, in chiding sin," brands Jaques' critical spirit as mere cynicism induced by dissipation and by a disease which Shakespeare expected his audience to recognize as a familiar pathological state of melancholy. Such an attitude suggests that Shakespeare singled out for rebuke Jaques' assumption of the manners and methods of the formal satirists, and of the dramatists who inherited their stock and trade. It shows that he was unsympathetic with the importation of this harsh spirit of a hitherto alien literary form into the comedies of Marston and Jonson.

However, it is clear that Shakespeare in *As You Like It* is experimenting more boldly than ever before with the recently revealed possibilities of dramatic satire. Under this influence he assigns to Touchstone new functions. The name given to this clown suggests that he is definitely set over against Jaques as a representative of what his author conceived to be a sounder employment of the satirist's function. He serves as a motley test and revelation of what is abnormal in the actions of the others. Most of his ridicule is exercised, in the approved manner of Will Kempe, by parody. He burlesques Silvius' extravagantly expressed love for Phebe, a convention of Italian pastoral plays; he parodies Jaques' atrabilious soliloquies; and he later performs the same doubtful service for Orlando's sentimental love-rhymes. His marriage with Audrey is a caricature of the lavish mating which takes place at the end of the play. This sort of fooling was the approved business of Shakespeare's clown as long as he was played by Will Kempe; but in *As You Like It* the parody is extended until by permeating many of the scenes it gains a new and larger dramatic importance. In the latter parts of the play, Touchstone uses also the elaborate rhetorical formalism characteristic of Robert Armin, who probably first played the role, to deride certain follies of courtly society, notably the complicated ritual developed for gentlemanly quarreling and dueling. Touchstone expresses most of his good-natured criticism of folly while in the company of Jaques, whose con-

descending patronage is successfully ridiculed by almost every word of his supposed protégé.

The presence of this pair in the Forest of Arden makes it seem at times a critic's haven. From this safe spot the characters can hurl comment at the social conventions from the authority of which they have happily escaped. In such a region even the distortions of formal satire are softened in outline. The appearance of Jaques, then, signalizes Shakespeare's first participation in the satiric movement, which after 1599 began to capture English comedy. The present study of the figure's character and function, it is hoped, has clarified the dramatist's first response to the influence of the movement. He rejects as presumptuous the tone of severe moral castigation adopted by most of the English practitioners in both formal satire and satiric drama. Yet in *As You Like It* he shows how a consciously satiric attitude, when accommodated to his more humane temper, could enrich his comic practice. This spirit, here first successfully domiciled in Shakespeare's art, took many interesting forms in his subsequent work and effected important changes in his comic invention during the first decade of the seventeenth century. These developments will be set forth in a later study.

Wit, "Mixt Wit," and the Bee in Amber

By W. LEE USTICK and HOYT H. HUDSON

What is he *Euphues*, that knowing thy witte, and seeing thy folly, but will rather punish they leaudnesse, then pittie thy heauinesse? . . . Too true it is, that as the sea Crab swimmeth alwayes against the streame, so wit alwayes striueth against wisedome: And as the Bee is oftentimes hurt with hir owne Honny, so is witte not seldome plagued with his owne conceipt.

—Lyly, *Euphues*, ed. Arber (1868), pp. 60–61

WE ARE used to hearing the story of how English poets about the year 1800 rebelled against the poetic mores of their predecessors — particularly against the closed couplet, stilted diction, and the figure of personification; but we may or may not be as acutely conscious of the fact that the generation of Pope was itself in no less sharp revolt against a poetic style which had been common if not dominant for a time in the seventeenth century. Or if we are conscious of that fact, we are likely to be a little vague as to just what Pope's generation revolted against. Pope himself was quite clear on the subject. Of primary interest is a passage from his letter to Henry Cromwell, December 17, 1710,[1] wherein he says of Richard Crashaw:

. . . nothing regular or just can be expected from him. All that regards design, form, fable, which is the soul of poetry; all that concerns exactness, or consent of parts, which is the body, will probably be wanting. Only pretty conceptions, fine metaphors, glittering expressions, and something of a neat cast of verse, which are properly the dress, gems, or loose ornaments of poetry, may be found in these verses.

With this must be read the lines on the "conceit" in *An Essay on Criticism* (1711), which lay in manuscript at the time of Pope's letter about Crashaw:

[1] *Works*, ed. W. Elwin and J. W. Croker, VI (1871), 116.

Some to conceit alone their taste confine,
And glitt'ring thoughts struck out at ev'ry line;
Pleased with a work where nothing's just or fit;
One glaring chaos and wild heap of wit.
Poets, like painters, thus unskilled to trace
The naked nature, and the living grace,
With gold and jewels cover ev'ry part,
And hide with ornaments their want of art.

These passages indict poets whose work lacked organic design and coherence — and lacked these qualities because the poets were cultivating the conceit. Here the apostle of "correctness" was following along a way that Boileau had led, nearly forty years earlier. French poetry had broken out with its measles of conceits sooner than English poetry by at least one generation, and its cure, under Boileau, came correspondingly earlier. For our present purpose, it is significant that Boileau introduces his discussion of conceits under the topic of the epigram. The epigram was the wooden horse by which conceits had been carried into the city of poetry. Boileau would allow the epigram to retain the conceit, but decries the tendency of other poetry to become infected with it. His dictum on conceits was thus expressed in English by William Soames, just ten years after the first appearance of *L'Art Poétique*:

The *Epigram*, with little art compos'd,
Is one good sentence in a Distich clos'd.[1]
These points, that by *Italians* first were priz'd,
Our ancient Authors knew not, or despis'd:
The Vulgar, dazled with their glaring Light,
To their false pleasures quickly they invite;
But publick Favor so increas'd their pride,
They overwhelm'd *Parnassus* with their Tide.
The Madrigal at first was overcome,

[1] But Boileau had written:

"L'Épigramme, plus libre en son tour plus borné,
N'est souvent qu'un bon mot de deux rimes orné" —

which is quite another thing. For the most part Soames has followed Boileau rather faithfully. Boileau examines dispassionately, rather than praises, the epigram. It is of some interest that this is the translation of *L'Art Poétique* known to Pope. We quote from Pope's own copy, bearing his autograph and numerous marginal notations in his handwriting, which is now in the Huntington Library.

And the proud Sonnet fell by the same Doom;
With these grave Tragedy adorn'd her flights,
And mournful Elegy her Funeral Rites:
A Hero never fail'd 'em on the Stage,
Without his [1] point a Lover durst not rage;
The Amorous Shepherds took more care to prove
True to their Point, than Faithful to their Love.
Each word, like *Janus*, had a double face:
And Prose, as well as Verse allow'd it place:
The Lawyer with Conceits adorn'd his Speech,
The Parson without Quibling could not Preach,
At last affronted Reason look'd about,
And from all serious matters shut 'em out:
Declar'd that none should use 'em without Shame,
Except a scattering in the Epigram;
Provided that, by Art, and in due time
They turn'd upon the Thought, and not the Rhime.
Thus in all parts disorders did abate;
Yet Quiblers in the Court had leave to prate:
Insipid Jesters, and unpleasant Fools,
A Corporation of dull Punning Drolls.
'Tis not, but that sometimes a dextrous Muse
May with advantage a turn'd Sence abuse,
And, on a word, may trifle with address;
But above all avoid the fond excess,
And think not, when your Verse and Sence are lame,
With a dull Point to Tag your Epigram. [2]

Yet even before Soames gave Boileau an English dress, George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham, had echoed some of Boileau's ideas in *An Essay Upon Poetry* (1682). Thirty years earlier than the recorded strictures of Pope, then, we find Buckingham attacking that kind of poetry which consisted of a series of flashes, or points, which might be related but were not organically coherent. Buckingham is for the moment speaking of the elegy:

Their greatest fault, who in this kind have writ,
Is neither want of words, nor dearth of wit;
But though this Muse harmonious numbers yield,
And every Couplet be with fancy fill'd;

[1] *This* in the text; the *t* has been crossed out, presumably by Pope.
[2] Nicolas Boileau, *The Art of Poetry*, tr. Wm. Soames (1683), pp. 21–23.

> If yet a just coherence be not made
> Between each thought, and the whole model layed
> So right, that every step may higher rise,
> As in a Ladder, till it reach the Skies;
> Trifles like these perhaps of late have past,
> And may be lik'd awhile, but never last;
> 'Tis Epigram, 'tis Point, 'tis what you will,
> But not an Elegie, nor writ with skill.

Again, of poetry in general, Buckingham had said:

> 'Tis not a Flash of Fancy which sometimes
> Dasling our Minds, sets off the slightest Rimes;
> Bright as a blaze, but in a moment done;
> True Wit is everlasting, like the Sun.

Boileau, Buckingham, and Pope were not attacking a straw man. Aside from what we know of the practice of Cowley, Cleveland, Crashaw, and others, there had actually been expressed a theory of poetry as a string of epigrams. It is true that the proponent of this theory, Thomas Pecke, was no important literary figure. In his bumptiousness, nevertheless, he blurted out a principle (here italicized) which many others seem to have believed in and used as a basis for their practice:

> Although no part of Poetry, but is at my command: I have made choice of Epigrams, as the very Nerves of this exquisite Art. *For if a Poem be good, it consists of nothing else, but various Epigrams; cemented by a dexterous sagacity.* And not onely Verse, but Prose, is dull, and languishing, unlesse the sparkling Genius of the Epigrammatist, be artifically interwoven.

This was printed in 1659, as a part of the address "To the Ingenious Readers" prefixed to Pecke's *Parnassi Puerperium*. The fact is, of course, that the heyday of the epigram *as a separate form* was over. Never again in England has there come such a spate of epigrams as flowed in the years from 1595 to 1620; and the momentum set up during that period was felt for twenty or thirty years more. But the first flush of interest was lost. The emblem, a related form, appealed to Puritanical poets such as Wither and Quarles. But from 1625 forward, the more solid writers tended to decry and slight the epigram. And poets were finding that they could retain all of the advantages

of the epigram in elegies, verse-epistles, descriptive poems, and even in lyrics and the drama, without stooping to a trivial form which dissipated the powers of the writer and the attention of the reader. Hence, while Pecke's clear declaration in favor of poetry which makes use of sheer intellectual devices to gain its effect seems to ally him on the one hand with the makers of conceits, on the other hand it announces that very neo-classical taste which was to cherish couplets of "epigrammatic" neatness. The chief value of Pecke's observation, for our present purpose, however, is that he illuminates the practice of many of his contemporaries, with whom the cement of "a dexterous sagacity" took the place of the "design, form, fable" later to be demanded by Pope.

But before presenting some specimens of poetry which exactly embody the aesthetic theory set forth by Pecke, it will be enlightening to consider the underlying principle of the eighteenth century's indictment of Cowley, Crashaw, and its other whipping boys, whom we know as the "metaphysical" poets. This has to do with Wit, for the pernicious "conceit" was but a product of a certain notion of this quality.

It is well known that the term "wit" had from early times the meaning of "intellect" or "mind"; not until the sixteenth century did it take on any slightest tinge of the meaning connected with surprise and amusement which we today normally associate with it. To the Elizabethan, "wit" still meant primarily "intellect" or "mental capacity," though it had also such meanings, apparently derivative from the central one, as "understanding," "wisdom," even "power of imagination" or "invention."[1] "Wit" might also be qualified and thus given a special sense. So Robert Johnson, as early as 1601, distinguished "a working and craftie witte," "quicke wits," etc.[2] But the

[1] Cf. "Assist me, some extemporal god of rhyme, for I am sure I shall turn sonnet. Devise, wit; write, pen; for I am for whole volumes in folio." (*Love's Labour's Lost*, I, ii.)

[2] "For a working and craftie witte drawes commonlie with it a doubtfull and wauering iudgement . . . Such as *Clement* the seuenth, who hauing a pregnant witte, and a deepe knowledge in all the affaires of the world, yet comming to pointes of execution, was verie vnfortunatelie irresolute." (*Essaies, or Rather Imperfect Offers* [1601], sigs. B 5–B 6.)

Especially interesting because of its relation to what will be said later in this article is the statement that

"... Quicke wits are readie in speech, but affected, high-flying Poets, but seldome

word "wit," unqualified, in Elizabethan times still held closely to its more central meaning of "mental capacity" or, simply, "mind."

During the seventeenth century the word was in transition. Ben Jonson's use of it, in *Timber* (probably written not long before his death in 1637), shows that he held to the older meaning.[1] The turning point was apparently about 1640, when Thomas Hobbes wrote of it. Contrary to the sensual disposition in man which induces dulness, he says, is

> that *quick ranging* of mind . . . which is joined with *curiosity* of comparing the things that come into the mind, one with another: in which comparison, a man delighteth himself either with finding unexpected *similitude* of things, otherwise much unlike, in which men place the excellency of *fancy*, and from whence proceed those grateful similes, metaphors, and other tropes, by which both *poets* and *orators* have it in their power to make things please or displease, and shew well or ill to others, as they like themselves; or else in discerning suddenly *dissimilitude* in things that otherwise appear the same. And this virtue of the mind is that by which men attain to exact and perfect *knowledge*; and the pleasure thereof consisteth in continual instruction, and in distinction of places, persons, and seasons, and is commonly termed by the name of *judgment*: for, to judge is nothing else, but to distinguish or discern: and both *fancy* and *judgment* are commonly comprehended under the name of *wit*, which seemeth to be a tenuity and agility of spirits, contrary to that restiness of the spirits supposed in those that are dull.[2]

"Wit," as Hobbes uses it, has a much subtler sense than mere "intellect." "Wit" seems, with him, to embrace two functions of the intellect: that which perceives similarities (Fancy), and that which

Graue Orators, commonlie betaking themselues to an humorous kinde of iesting, to play vpon any thing, and stirre the spleene [the seat of laughter], rather finding causes why a thing should be amisse, then willing to amende." (Sigs. B 6–B 7.)

[1] Cf. *Timber; or, Discoveries*, ed. F. E. Schelling (1892), p. 21 (in the section "*De vere argutis*").

[2] *Human Nature, or the Fundamental Elements of Policy* (dated 1640 but not published until 1650); in *English Works*, ed. Sir William Molesworth, IV (1840), 55–56. Hobbes is careful to differentiate the "*quick ranging* of mind" from "levity, which betrayeth also mobility in the spirits, but in excess. An example whereof is in them that in the midst of any serious discourse, have their minds diverted to every little jest of witty observation." (*Ibid.*) Cf. the *Leviathan* (1651), Pt. I, Chap. VIII: "But without steadiness, and direction to some end, a

perceives dissimilarities (Judgment), and in Hobbes's view is stimulated by the "passion" of "curiosity." [1] As the years passed, Hobbes apparently modified his view to the extent of excluding Judgment from Wit, which he used almost synonymously with Fancy; [2] but Hobbes's distinction between Fancy and Judgment seems to have started rolling a ball which was kept in play throughout the century.

A decade after Hobbes wrote, his friend William D'Avenant is found still further refining on the term. In his *Discourse upon Gondibert* (Paris, 1650) he says:

> That which is not, yet is accounted *Wit*, I will but slightly remember; which seems very incident to imperfect youth and sickly age; Young men (as if they were not quite delivered from Child-hood whose first exercise is Language) imagine it consists in the Musick of words, and believe they are made wise by refining their speech above the vulgar Dialect . . . From the esteem of speaking they proceed to the admiration of what are commonly called *Conceits*, things that sound like the knacks or toyes of ordinary *Epigrammatists*: and from thence, after more conversation and variety of objects, grow up to some force of *Fancy* . . .
>
> Old men, that have forgot their first Child-hood, and are returning to their second, think it lies in *Agnominations* [i. e., paronomasias], and in a kind of an alike tinkling of words . . . (Pp. 46–48.)

True wit, on the other hand, does not in D'Avenant's opinion entirely exclude the "conceit," as one may gather from his concluding remarks on the head of Wit as he himself attempted to use it:

great fancy is one kind of madness . . ." etc. Elsewhere he distinguishes between the function of Fancy and of Judgment, making the former account for "the ornaments of a Poem," the latter for its "strength and structure." ("The Answer of Mr. Hobbs to Sr. William D'Avenant's Preface before Gondibert," in D'Avenant's *Discourse upon Gondibert* [1650], p. 130.)

[1] Hobbes's physiological explanation is "that sense proceedeth from the action of external objects upon the *brain*, or some internal *substance* of the *head*; and that the *passions* proceed from the alteration there made, and continued to the *heart*." (*Human Nature*, Chap. X.)

[2] "For men more generally affect and admire Fancie than they do either Judgment, or Reason, or Memory, or any other intellectual Vertue; and for the pleasantness of it, give to it alone the name of Wit, accounting Reason and Judgment but for a dull entertainment." (Preface to *Homer's Odysses* [1675]; in *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn, II [1908], 70.) Although Hobbes is here only reporting that men give the name of Wit to Fancy, he seems by this time not to disapprove of the nomenclature.

Nor will I presume to call the matter of which the Ornaments or Substantiall parts of this Poem are compos'd, *Wit*; but onely tell you my endeavour was, in bringing Truth (too often absent) home to mens bosoms, to lead her through unfrequented and new wayes, and from the most remote Shades; by representing Nature though not in an affected, yet in an unusuall dresse. (P. 50.)

The variable, in D'Avenant's case, is "affected" as distinct from "unusuall." Wit, to him, depends chiefly upon the element of surprise or the "unusuall."

Possibly D'Avenant had discussed these matters with Hobbes, with whom we know he was associated in Paris at the time the *Discourse upon Gondibert* was written — to which, indeed, Hobbes contributed a sympathetic rejoinder. If so, it would have been only natural for D'Avenant to adopt Hobbes's view of figures of speech. In 1637 Hobbes had published an epitome of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which is interesting, if for nothing else, for deviations from the original. In Hobbes's epitome — *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique. Containing in substance all that Aristotle hath written in his Three Bookes of that subject* — it is stated that "A *Metaphor* ought not to be so farre fetcht, as that the Similitude may not easily appeare" (p. 156) — exactly echoing Aristotle. But in adapting Aristotle's eleventh chapter of Book III, where it is said that "metaphors should be drawn from objects which are proper to the object, but not too obvious," [1] Hobbes chooses to place the emphasis strongly on the last element of Aristotle's principle, and so to make Aristotle accord exactly with contemporary English poetic practice (although he is dealing here with rhetorical devices of *oratory* rather than of *poetry*, the distinction is unimportant, as the seventeenth century did not distinguish between rhetoric in oratory and rhetoric in poetry):

Such *Metaphors* as these [i.e., attributing life to inanimate things, as in saying that the Sword "devours"] come into a Mans minde by the observation of things that have similitude and proportion one to another. And the more unlike, and unproportionable the things be otherwise, the more *grace* hath the *Metaphor*. (Pp. 173–74.)

[1] Tr. J. H. Freese (Loeb Class. Lib.), p. 407.

In the second sentence of this passage we catch an early glimpse of what the eighteenth century deemed a major heresy of their fathers.

By the 1660's, Wit was admittedly a term susceptible of various interpretations. Cowley apparently realized the fact, though he floundered hopelessly if his object in writing his *Ode on Wit* was to define and distinguish. In critical writings, the most characteristic meaning had to do, as in Hobbes, with happy and surprising comparisons (or, on the other hand, finding points of dissimilarity between things apparently alike). Robert Boyle, for one, expresses this view in his *Occasional Reflections* (1665), and by no means with disparagement:

> . . . that nimble and acceptable Faculty of the Mind, whereby some Men have a readiness, and subtilty, in conceiving things, and a quickness, and neatness, in expressing them, all which the custom of speaking comprehends under the name of *Wit.*

The exercise of this faculty, says Boyle,

> keeps a Man from being easily surpris'd by the Subject he has occasion to consider, and enables him oftentimes to surprise his Hearers; and . . . such a kind of surprise is one of the most endearing Circumstances of the productions of Wit. (Pp. 37–38.)

But surprise is not, in Boyle's opinion, to be sought at the expense of naturalness, for drawing one's figures "from the very Nature of the thing he speaks of" is a surer sign of Wit "than the saying things more specious and elaborate, that appear to be Antienter than the Occasion, as is usual in Epigrams, and other solemn premeditated pieces of Wit." Wit helps a man when he must "exercise his Invention, and put it upon coining various and new Expressions, to sute . . . variety of unfamiliar Subjects" (*ibid*). Finally, though "good Comparisons" be a chief good resulting from Wit (p. 39), the obverse is served by Judgment:

> as the being able to find the latent resemblances betwixt things seemingly unlike, make up a great part of what we are wont to call *Wit*; so the being able to discern the unobvious disparities of things manifestly resembling, is one of the chief things that displays the Faculty, Men call Judgment. (P. 46.)

Boyle, though he substitutes "wit" for Hobbes's "fancy," follows Hobbes in distinguishing between Wit (a "ranging" faculty) and Judgment (a corrective one). So, likewise, does that too much despised butt of Dryden's satire, Richard Flecknoe, who in "A Short Discourse of the English Stage," appended to *Love's Kingdom* (1664), states the case thus:

To compare our English Dramatick Poets together . . . *Shakespear* excelled in a natural Vein, *Fletcher* in Wit, and *Johnson* in Gravity and ponderousness of Style . . . Comparing him [i.e., Jonson] with *Shakespear*, you shall see the difference betwixt Nature and Art; and with *Fletcher*, the difference betwixt Wit and Judgment: Wit being an exuberant thing, like *Nilus*, never more commendable then when it overflowes; but Judgement a stayed and reposed thing, alwayes containing it self within its bounds and limits.

. . . And here to speak a word or two of Wit, it is the spirit and quintessence of speech, extracted out of the substance of the thing we speak of, having nothing of the superfice, or dross of words (as clenches, quibbles, gingles, and such like trifles have) it is that, in pleasant and facetious discourse, as Eloquence is in grave and serious; not learnt by Art and Precept, but Nature and Company.[1]

It is the thinking of such critics, beginning apparently with Hobbes, which lies behind Locke. By Locke the distinction between Wit and Judgment is given the most satisfactory statement up to his time:

[1] To Flecknoe, Wit is a *social* virtue — "the spirit and quintessence of speech . . . not learnt by Art and Precept, but Nature and Company" — a new note, prophetic of the coffeehouse and its influence, and a very early expression of the point of view which stresses urbanity. (For a later pronouncement compare John Dennis, *Miscellanies in Verse and Prose* [1693], Preface: "Scarron's Burlesque has nothing of a Gentleman in it, little of good Sense, and consequently little of true Wit.") Flecknoe elsewhere apotheosized Wit, rather inconsequently, as the source of *virtue*: "*Wit*, like *Beauty*, has somewhat in it of *Divine*, and they profane either, who use them to vitious ends . . . It is the spirit and quintessence of speech, extracted out of the substance of things; and a spiritual fire that rarefies and renders every thing spiritual like it self; it is a soaring quality, that just as *Dedalus* wings, elevates those who have it above other men; and is the same in the *brain*, as *Nobility* is in the *blood*. In fine, it is somewhat above expression; and easier to admire, then tell you what it is: not acquir'd by *Art* and *Study*, but *Nature* and *Conversation*; . . . Rendring those who have it, *good* and *vertuous*, as well as *witty* men; and whosoever is otherwise, we may well conclude, wants as much of *wit*, as they do of being such." ("Of Wit," in *A Farrago of several Pieces* [1666], pp. 58–59.) The passage seems enthusiastic rather than critical, but is strangely prophetic of Coleridge's and Shelley's idea of the imagination as a spiritualizing force.

If in having our *Ideas* in the Memory ready at hand, consists quickness of parts; in this of having them unconfused, and being able nicely to distinguish one thing from another, where there is but the least difference, consists, in a great measure, the exactness of Judgment, and clearness of Reason, which is to be observed in one Man above another. And hence, perhaps, may be given some Reason of that common Observation, That Men who have a great deal of Wit, and prompt Memories, have not always the clearest Judgment, or deepest Reason. For *Wit* lying most in the assemblage of *Ideas*, and putting those together with quickness and variety, wherein can be found any resemblance or congruity, thereby to make up pleasant Pictures, and agreeable Visions in the Fancy: *Judgment*, on the contrary, lies quite on the other side, in separating carefully *Ideas* one from another, wherein can be found the least difference, thereby to avoid being misled by Similitude, and by affinity to take one thing for another. This is a way of proceeding quite contrary to Metaphor and Allusion, wherein, for the most part, lies that entertainment and pleasantry of Wit, which strikes so lively on the Fancy; and therefore so acceptable to all People, because its Beauty appears at first sight, and there is required no labour of thought, to examine what Truth or Reason there is in it. The Mind, without looking any farther, rests satisfied with the pleasantness of the Picture, and the gayety of the Fancy: And it is a kind of an affront to go about to examine it, by the severe Rules of Truth, and good Reason; whereby it appears, that it consists in something, that is not perfectly conformable to them. [1]

For the seventeenth century, Locke's clear-cut distinction between wit and judgment is almost the final word. Dryden, for all his critical acuteness, added little, but rather tended, if anything, to obscure the issue. "Propriety of thoughts and words" — Dryden's statement of his own practice which, he says, he drew from Virgil, who "is everywhere above conceits of epigrammatic wit, and gross hyperboles" [2] — is too general to be of much help.[3] He does, it is true, imply different

[1] *An Essay concerning Humane Understanding* (1690), II, xi, 2.

[2] *Sylvae* (1685), Preface (*Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker [1926], I, 256).

[3] Dryden had earlier defined Wit as "a propriety of Thoughts and Words; or in other terms, Thought and Words, elegantly adapted to the Subject." ("The Authors Apology for Heroique Poetry; and Poetique Licence," prefixed to *The State of Innocence* [1677], sig. c2^{v}.) The word "elegantly" injects a new element and foreshadows eighteenth-century criticism. Cf. Pope's "True Wit, I believe, may be defined a justness of thought, and a facility of expression" (letter to Wycherley, Dec. 26, 1704), the precursor of "True wit is nature to advantage dressed" (*Essay on Criticism* [1709]), wherein Pope, as Dr. Johnson said, "depresses"

categories of Wit, corresponding with those of Hobbes and Locke, in the Dedication of the *Æneis* (1697):

> Segrais has distinguished the readers of poetry, according to their capacity of judging, into three classes (he might have said the same of writers too, if he had pleased): in the lowest form he places those whom he calls *les petits esprits*; such things as are our upper-gallery audience in a playhouse, who like nothing but the husk and rind of wit; prefer a quibble, a conceit, an epigram, before solid sense and elegant expression. These are mob readers: if Virgil and Martial stood for Parliament-men, we know already who would carry it . . . Their authors are of the same level, fit to represent them on a mountebank's stage, or to be masters of the ceremonies in a bear-garden. [1]

And he goes on to discuss readers (and writers) of the "middle sort," "not yet arrived so far as to discern the difference betwixt fustian, or ostentatious sentences, and the true sublime," and finally the third sort, "souls of the highest rank, and truest understanding." Of Wit he says nothing, in this connection; but he plainly has in mind (even though he does not make sharp distinctions) Wit as the characteristic attribute of the first of the three categories, possibly also of the second, and Judgment as the attribute of the last:

> And whereas poems which are produced by the vigour of imagination only have a gloss upon them at first which time wears off, the works of judgment are like the diamond; the more they are polished, the more lustre they receive.

Sir William Temple, writing at the same time as Locke, is on the whole much of Locke's opinion. He admits the necessity of Wit (which he used as synonymous with Fancy), but like Locke distinguishes sharply between Fancy and Judgment, and like Dryden would hang clogs on Wit:

> Besides the heat of Invention and liveliness of Wit, there must be the coldness of good Sense and soundness of Judgment, to distinguish between things and conceptions which at first sight or upon short glances seem alike, to choose among infinite productions of Wit and Fancy which are worth

Wit "below its natural dignity, and reduces it from strength of thought to happiness of language." (Pope, *Works*, II [1871], 51 n.)

[1] *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. Ker, II, 223–24.

preserving and cultivating, and which are better stifled in the Birth . . . Without the Forces of Wit all Poetry is flat and languishing; without the succors of Judgment 'tis wild and extravagant.[1]

Still more insistent upon the necessity of Fancy in poetry is John Dennis, who, although he sanctioned Judgment as a check on "enthusiasm," followed Hobbes in insisting on the necessity for "passion" as the basis of poetry, and could therefore give as "a true description of Wit," "a just mixture of Reason and Extravagance."[2] Congreve, who is after all more concerned with distinguishing between Wit and Humor than between Wit and Judgment, and moreover is thinking chiefly if not exclusively of the stage, adds little to our understanding of seventeenth-century Wit, though he shows the approach of his contemporaries, as the word was used in one special sense, to modern usage, and he bears witness to the difficulty of defining so comprehensive or misunderstood a term as Wit had come to be, as well as to the fact that Humor and Wit were themselves often confused by his contemporaries.[3]

Had all writers held to the definitions and distinctions made by Hobbes, Boyle, and Locke, the excesses of the seventeenth century might have been avoided. But most people were less clearheaded. And especially, as we shall later see, the school-exercises in rhetoric placed a premium upon wit of a different order. How confused the issue had become even by the 1670's is well illustrated by what Isaac Barrow said in his *Sermon against foolish Talking and Jesting*:

But first it may be demanded, What the Thing we speak of is? . . . It is indeed a Thing so versatile and multiform, appearing in so many Shapes, so many Postures, so many Garbs, so variously apprehended by several Eyes and Judgments, that it seemeth no less hard to settle a clear and certain Notion

[1] *Of Poetry* (1690); in *Critical Essays*, ed. Spingarn, III (1909), 81.

[2] *Miscellanies in Verse and Prose* (1693), Preface. The basis of this opinion is perhaps Hobbes's dictum, in the *Leviathan* (1651): "In a good poem, whether it be *epic*, or *dramatic*; as also in *sonnets*, *epigrams*, and other pieces, both judgment and fancy are required: but the fancy must be more eminent; because they please for the extravagancy; but ought not to displease by indiscretion." (Ed. Molesworth, III [1839], 58.) In the Preface to his translation of the *Odyssey* (1675) Hobbes was to champion "the Sublimity of a Poet, which is that Poetical Fury [sic] which the Readers for the most part call for."

[3] Congreve, *An Essay on Humour in Comedy* (a letter to John Dennis, July 10, 1695).

thereof, than to make a Portrait of *Proteus*, or to define the Figure of the fleeting Air. Sometimes it lieth in pat Allusion to a known Story, or in seasonable Application of a trivial Saying, or in forging an apposite Tale: Sometimes it playeth in Words and Phrases, taking Advantage from the Ambiguity of their Sense, or the Affinity of their Sound: Sometimes it is wrapp'd in a Dress of humorous Expression: Sometimes it lurketh under an odd Similitude: Sometimes it is lodged in a sly Question, in a smart Answer, in a quirkish Reason, in a shrewd Intimation, in cunningly diverting, or cleverly retorting an Objection: Sometimes it is couched in a bold Scheme of Speech, in a tart Irony, in a lusty Hyperbole, in a startling Metaphor, in a plausible Reconciling of Contradictions, or in acute Nonsense; Sometimes a scenical Representation of Persons or Things, a counterfeit Speech, a mimical Look or Gesture passeth for it. Sometimes an affected Simplicity, sometimes a presumptuous Bluntness giveth it Being. Sometimes it riseth from a lucky Hitting upon what is Strange; sometimes from a crafty wresting obvious Matter to the Purpose. Often it consisteth in one knows not what, and springeth up one can hardly tell how. Its ways are unaccountable, and inexplicable, being answerable to the numberless Rovings of Fancy, and Windings of Language. It is, in short, a Manner of Speaking out of the simple and plain Way (such as Reason teacheth, and proveth Things by) which by a pretty, surprizing Uncouthness [i.e., oddity, unaccustomedness] in Conceit or Expression, doth affect and amuse the Fancy, stirring in it some Wonder, and breeding some Delight thereto. It raiseth Admiration, as signifying a nimble Sagacity of Apprehension, a special Felicity of Invention, a Vivacity of Spirits, and Reach of Wit, more than vulgar; it seeming to argue a rare Quickness of Parts, that one can fetch in remote Conceits applicable; a notable Skill that he can dextrously accommodate them to the Purpose before him; together with a lively Briskness of Humour, not apt to damp those sportful Flashes of Imagination. . . . It also procureth Delight, by gratifying Curiosity with its Rareness, or Semblance of Difficulty. (As Monsters, not for their Beauty, but their Rarity; as juggling Tricks, not for their Use, but their Abstruseness, are beheld with Pleasure;) by diverting the Mind from its Road of serious Thoughts, by instilling Gaiety, and Airiness of Spirit; by provoking to such Disposition of Spirit in Way of Emulation, or Complaisance; and by seasoning Matters otherwise distasteful or insipid, with an unusual and thence grateful Tange.[1]

[1] Quoted in *An Essay Towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire, and Ridicule* [by Corbyn Morris] (1744), Introduction, pp. vii–ix. For notable later confusions in the meaning of Wit, typical of the early eighteenth century, compare Pope, *Works*, II, 25–26.

It is Addison who finally clarified the matter, summing up the controversy most succinctly and comprehensively, and joining elements which are readily traceable in large part to the pronouncements cited above. He quoted from Locke's *Essay concerning Humane Understanding*, and supplemented Locke by pointing out that not every resemblance of ideas constitutes Wit, but only such resemblances as give "Delight and Surprize to the Reader." [1] But Addison carries the discussion still further and distinguishes between "true wit" (a term already in use) and what he called "mixt wit." ("False wit," which relies on mere tricks of echoing and varying letters or syllables to force verbal resemblances, he discards out of hand.) "True wit" he holds to be "Resemblance of Ideas." But

there is another kind of Wit which consists partly in the Resemblance of Ideas, and partly in the Resemblance of Words; which for Distinction Sake I shall call *mixt Wit*. This Kind of Wit is that which abounds in *Cowley*, more than in any Author that ever wrote. Mr. *Waller* has likewise a great deal of it. Mr. *Dryden* is very sparing in it. *Milton* had a Genius much above it. *Spencer* is in the same Class with *Milton*. The *Italians*, even in their Epic Poetry, are full of it. Monsieur *Boileau*, who formed himself upon the ancient Poets, has every where rejected it with Scorn. If we look after mixt Wit among the *Greek* Writers, we shall find it no where but in the Epigrammatists. . . . If we look into the *Latin* Writers, we find none of this mixt Wit in *Virgil*, *Lucretius*, or *Catullus*; very little in *Horace*; but a great deal of it in *Ovid*, and scarce any thing else in *Martial*.

.

. . . Mixt wit . . . is a Composition of Punn and true Wit, and is more or less perfect as the Resemblance lies in the Ideas or in the Words: Its Foundations are laid partly in Falsehood and partly in Truth: Reason puts in her Claim for one Half of it, and Extravagance for the other. The only Province therefore for this kind of Wit, is Epigram, or those little occasional Poems that in their own Nature are nothing else but a Tissue of Epigrams.[2]

Now the fact is that Addison's "false wit" and his "mixt wit" had both been objects of assiduous cultivation by epigram-writers in England ever since the early sixteenth century. Schoolboys had been taught to build verses upon "the Resemblance and Congruity some-

[1] Like D'Avenant, he insists especially upon the element of *surprise*.
[2] *Spectator*, No. 62.

times of single Letters, as in Anagrams, Chronograms, Lipograms, and Acrosticks. Sometimes of Syllables, as in Ecchoes and Doggerel Rhymes. Sometimes of Words, as in Punns and Quibbles; and sometimes of whole Sentences or Poems, cast into the Figures of *Eggs*, *Axes*, or *Altars*." [1] To give specimens would occupy more space than is here available. But the reader is referred to the *Exequiae* (1587), the Oxford volume of epigrams, epitaphs, and elegies upon Sir Philip Sidney, where he will find a sepulchre, built of Latin verses, with the first letters of the verses spelling Sidney's name; he will find a pair of wings; he will find puns on almost every page (Sidney was a horse-lover, according to one poet, because φίλος and ἵππος made up his first name); and if he will look at the many other academic volumes (these are chosen because they should be the most favorable specimens of approved and serious epigram-writing), he will find also chronograms, anagrams, and lipograms. The search for something to say upon a subject everyone was writing about, sent the epigrammatist far afield. The result is that familiar object of criticism, the far-fetched conceit or, in Addison's phrase, "mixt wit." Milton's conceit of readers turned to stone and thus forming a monument for Shakespeare, seems not at all extreme when it is read along with other memorial and encomiastic verses of the time. Crashaw's "Two walking baths, two weeping motions, Portable and compendious oceans," had been preceded long before by this epigram, printed in Thomas Dekker's *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603):

> The Queene was brought by water to White Hall,
> At euery stroake, the Oares teares let fall,
> More clung about the Barge: Fish vnder water
> Wept out their eyes of pearle, and swom blind after.
> I thinke the Barge-men might with easier thyes
> Haue rowde her thither in her peoples eyes:
> For howsoe're, thus much my thoughts haue skand,
> S'had come by water, had she come by land.

And forty-five years before this, among Nicholas Grimald's contributions to the *Songes and Sonettes* (1557), we find that remarkable poem upon the death of Sir James Wilford:

[1] Addison's specification of false wit (*ibid*).

For Wilford wept first men, then ayr also,
For Wilford felt the waters wayfull wo.

.

So wayld the ayr: that, clowds consumde, remaynd
No dropes, but drouth the parched erth sustaynd.
So greeted floods: that, where ther rode before
A ship, a car may go safe on the shore . . .

This, as we know, was a translation from Theodorus Beza's epicedium upon Guillaume Budé. And it is pertinent to our present line of thought to notice that Courthope singled out as a fountainhead of "the 'metaphysical' style of Cowley and his contemporaries" this very Nicholas Grimald, who translated epigrams from Neo-Latin writers and from the Greek Anthology, and of whom Courthope also said, "In him the genius of the epigrammatist predominates."[1]

Thus much having been said about seventeenth-century uses of "conceits" and "mixt wit," the stage is set for our principal exhibit, a poem which represents what Pope and Addison (as well as Dryden, even Buckingham, and others) were in rebellion against. It occurs in a little-known poem in a rare volume published in the last decade of the seventeenth century, ascribed to William Dingley.[2] The volume is entitled *Poems on Several Occasions. Originals, and Translations. Printed in the Year 1694. And are to be Sold by most Booksellers.*[3] That is, the volume was printed the same year in which Dingley was a candidate for the bachelor's degree. Little wonder if it ignored Boileau's

[1] *History of English Poetry*, II (1897), 149.

[2] In the second edition of Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* (1721). Dingley was the son of a gentleman from the Isle of Wight, was educated at Winchester, matriculated at the age of eighteen at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1691; proceeded B.A. January 29, 1694/5, was a fellow and M.A. in 1697–98, B.D. in 1707. He became perpetual curate of Warborough, Oxon, and rector of All Saints Pavement, York, where he remained from 1722 until his death there in 1735. See Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses: . . . 1500–1714*, I (1891), 405.

[3] No place or printer is given. The volume seems not to be recorded in the Term Catalogues. The printer's ornament on the title-page, a mask with rings, in a sort of shield, appears on the title-page of William Cleever's *The Flower of Phisicke* (London: Roger Ward, 1590) — and, indeed, in many other volumes. It was used by A. Hart, with his initials inserted (Edinburgh, 1613 and 1619; see R. B. McKerrow, *Printers' & Publishers' Devices* [1913], No. 379). It was apparently a conventional device and seems to offer no lead to the identity of Dingley's publisher. The date on the title-page is attested, at least in one direction, by the inclusion in the volume of a poem "upon the Unseasonable Heat and Drought in April, Anno Domini 1694."

strictures on the epigram and jogged safely on in the tradition ingrained in its author at Winchester, where the practice of setting the boys Latin exercises based on Martial's epigrams seems to have been most strongly entrenched.

What Dingley has done is to string together, like beads on a wire, a series of epigrammatic "conceits" — as many of them as he could muster. Apparently, though his training had taught him condensation and "point" as the chief desiderata in a poem, it had also taught him that if one epigram on a given subject was good, two were better; and if by searching he could find out nineteen, happy man be his dole! Dingley did find out nineteen, all suggested, no doubt, by the epigrams of Martial on the bee and ant in amber, and the viper embalmed in poplar gum,[1] all of which Dingley has used in his poem [2] — a subject which to Herrick, brought up in the tradition of Jonson's brand of classicism, had suggested but a single succinct quatrain.[3] We print

[1] Amber, it will be recalled, was variously said to be the product of gum of the poplar and other trees, an exudation of the earth brought forth by the sun and solidified by sea water, etc. Tacitus (*Germania*, xlv) accepts the first explanation. Pliny (*Natural History*, XXXVII, 11) has a full and critical account of the origin of amber.

[2] "In an amber-drop the bee lies hid and lightens, so that it seems to be shut in its native sweets. Worthy reward for all its toils it has won; methinks itself would have wished so to die." (Martial, *Epigrams*, IV, 32; tr. W. C. A. Ker [Loeb Class. Lib.].)

"While an ant was roaming in the poplar shade a gummy drop enfolded the tiny insect. Thus, despised but now while life remained, it has become to-day precious by its death." (VI, 15.)

"While a viper crept along the weeping poplar-boughs there flowed a gummy drop o'er the beast that met its path, and while she marvelled to be stayed by that clinging dew, suddenly she grew stiff, enfettered by the congealing mass. Pride not thyself, Cleopatra, on thy royal sepulchre if a viper lies in a nobler tomb!" (IV, 59.)

The figure continued to attract English writers. Bacon, in the *Sylva Sylvarum*, writes: "Wee see, how *Flies*, and *Spiders*, and the like, get a *Sepulcher* in *Amber*, more *Durable*, than the *Monument*, and *Embalming* of the *Body* of any *King*." (Century I, Experiment 100.) The notion was still doing service — though in a modified form — even in the nineteenth century, as when Tennyson's brother wrote, bathetically:

> Oh! that the memories which survive us here
> Were half so lovely as these wings of thine!
> Pure relics of a blameless life, that shine
> Now thou art gone.
> (From "On Finding a Small Fly Crushed in a Book.")

[3] I saw a Flie within a Beade
Of Amber cleanly buried;
The Urne was little, but the room
More rich then *Cleopatra's* Tombe. (From *Hesperides* [1648].)

Dingley's poem the more gladly, because so far as we have been able to ascertain, the volume is excessively rare — if, indeed, the copy at the Huntington Library is not absolutely unique.

Upon a BEE *Entomb'd in* Amber.

Behold this happy Insect's Tomb,
Not sweet, but precious Honey-comb:
You'd think the Bee had brought it forth,
Alike in Colour, and in Worth.
Which to the view does represent,
A Murderer, and Monument.
I thought 'twas *Niobe* alone,
Whom Moisture harden'd into Stone:
But now the weeping Gem I see,
Transforms at once it self and Bee:
Since to Beholders each does seem,
The Gem a Bee, the Bee a Gem.
The Pyramids in *Ægypt's* Land,
Astonishment from all command:
Yet, happy Insect, happy thou,
A lesser, but a better Show;
The Pyramids would envy me,
Should I be thus Entomb'd like thee.
Thou with *Medusa* may'st compare,
Whose Viperous enchanted Hair,
Turn'd all Spectators into Stone,
Conquest and Trophy both in one;
But thou excellest her in this,
Thy self at once *Medusa* is,
Thy self the Metamorphosis.
Nature has chang'd her usual course,
But for the Better not the Worse;
While Jewels sprout from Poplar-Trees,
These bring forth Jewels, Jewels Bees.
Thus whilst the Bee through Amber shone,
With borrow'd Lustre, not her own,
The Sight so dazling did appear,
You'd think both Bees, both Jewels were.
The Golden Beast, like *Bacchus* Crown,
Translated to th'Æthereal Throne,
Does, as it were, refin'd appear,
Transform'd from Gold into a Star:

Congeal'd it lies in sparkling Gem,
You'd swear 'twas froze to Death in Flame.
Entangled there it self does shew,
A Labyrinth, and Monster too.
What Freeman would not pay that Fee
Which Prisoners give for Liberty,
To share in this Captivity.
The little Debtor (she, you know,
To Amber does this Yellow owe)
Thither as to her Prison came,
Her Debt and Prison both the same.
A worthy, honourable Cheat!
Whose very Fetters made her Great:
For while she mute in Thraldome lies,
Her buzzing Fame much swifter flies.
Tho' she confin'd, to us may seem,
Within the Limits of a Gem,
She's in effect, by being thus,
Extended through the Universe:
And by her forc'd, yet willing stay,
Debar'd from Flying, flies away.
Whose Hive, not long since, Thatcht we saw,
Like *Rome*'s old Capitol, with Straw;
She now in nobler Structure dwells,
Which *Rome*'s new Capitol excells.
Thou worthy Nurse of mighty *Jove*,
Supreme o're all the Gods above;
Tell me, thou Insect, tell me why,
When Harlots mounted to the Sky,
He did not thus thy Pains repay,
Deserving Heaven more than they?
But lo! I see thy proud Disdain
Has rendred Deifying vain.
So rich, so glorious thy Attire,
A radiant, not a burning Fire;
That all those Lamps which grace the Sky,
Are seen Unenvy'd by thy Eye.
'Twere Injury to fix thee there,
A brighter Constellation here.
Such is the dazling Garb she wears,
Such Honour from that Garb she bears,
That tho' her *Jove* be cloth'd with Rays
Immortal, and immortal Praise;
'Tis doubtful which does most confer,

The Bee on *Jove*, or *Jove* on her:
While she her self does represent,
As if to give the God, she meant,
Honour, instead of Nutriment.
Proud Animal! 'tis mere Self-love,
Which makes thee like *Narcissus* prove;
Who view'd himself in Chrystal Streams,
And, as he view'd, thence gather'd Flames:
In liquid Gum you clearer shine,
Others to Envy you incline,
Whilst you your self for Love repine.
True Looking-glass, wherein we view,
Not only Form, but Matter too.
The Eyes, which view this glorious Bee,
Are held almost as fast as she:
For while they gaze, in one, they view
Artificer, and Image too.
'Twas heedlessness this Artist taught,
Exact the Figure, yet not wrought;
Whom like *Sejanus* here we see,
Too truly slain in Effigy.
Fair *Phaethusa* (Stories shew)
A poplar-tree by Weeping grew;
Weeping (Oh! had it sooner came)
Enough to quench her Brother's Flame.
Hence first distill'd the precious Juice,
And Trees the Amber did produce;
From whence a three-fold Change we see,
From humane Shape sproughts up a Tree,
Thence came forth Gum, and thence a Bee.
A Bee, which thus you may divide,
Object of Pity, and of Pride:
It Sister does, and Brother seem,
It Weeps like her, it Shines like him;
In both their Fates does Sympathize,
At once bewails the Dead, and Dies.
Virgin, too like the *Crocodile*!
Whose treach'rous Tears to Snares beguile,
Thy Weeping's, by Experience known,
More Envious now than Pitteous grown.
Thy Tears, which first made thee a Tree,
And now again transform the Bee,
Harden themselves, and that, like Thee.

See how from Good, ariseth Ill!
While they bewail the Slain, they Kill.
But why, against th'industrious Bee,
Do Trees exert such Cruelty?
She little thinking e're to yield,
Securely Plunder'd all the Field;
For which she now in Chains must stay,
Chains richer than her former Prey.
Flowers, too weak to captive Bees,
Assistance crave from neighbour Trees;
Till they that were opprest before,
Retort the Dammage once they bore:
But Oh! 'tis thus, they add the more,
And, to deprive, increase the Store.
The cruel *Nero*, who (says Fame)
Rome doubly Dy'd in Blood and Flame,
Erected no such noble Throne;
No, tho' he built a Golden One,
As that wherein this Tyrant shone.
Most radiant, most illustrious Bee,
I'll to the *Phœnix* liken thee,
In Death as rare, as bright as She;
Tho' She to *Phœbus* owe his Night,
Extinguish'd by the Beams of Light;
Tho' thou a distant Fate dost bear,
Drown'd in the Deluge of a Tear.
Thy waxen Wings the Fate has sought,
Which those of *Icarus* once brought;
The cause whereby (as Stories tell)
So High he soar'd, so Deep he fell.
Yet thee much Happier I esteem,
Not over-whelm'd, tho' drown'd like him:
Thou more conspicuous dost appear
Than others above Water are,
Thy very Cov'ring makes thee clear.
Thou need'st not signalize thy Grave,
With any specious Epitaph,
Thy Crops is so transparent seen
In Golden Characters within.
Thus Death, which never grants Reprieve,
Is here made Life's Preservative.
The dark Recesses of the Tomb,
Become a pleasant, lightsome Room.
Th'unnatural, but honest Grave,

From a Devourer, chang'd to save;
In Justice does its Debt repay,
And give the Life it takes away.
Thy Dipping *Thetis* has out-done,
Who strove to Eternize her Son;
Bathing him in the *Stygian* Lake,
That he might ne're of *Styx* partake.
Thou that effectually dost gain,
For which she Dipt, but dipt in vain.
The Bee with *Hercules* compare,
Her lustre may with *Æta*'s share;
But not consume, not wasted be,
And so gain Immortality.
Eternal Insect! who would grieve
To Dye like thee, like thee to Live?
Jove is a Mortal thought by some,
'Cause ancient *Creet* can shew his tomb;
Oh! were he Bury'd there like thee,
His Tomb would prove him Deity.

Although poets before Dingley had commonly enough written more than one epigram on a given subject, and had even printed them consecutively with the caption "Another" at the beginning of each, indicating that they consciously sought to vary the figure — or indeed strung them together in a single poem [1] —Dingley's poem is noteworthy as an outstanding example, surpassing all others in this kind

[1] This was notably the practice of John Cleveland and his admirers. See, for instance, a poem in a volume of 1656, *Ex otio Negotium. Or, Martiall His Epigrams Translated. With Sundry Poems and Fancies, By R. Fletcher.* (Most of the poems in the volume were included, beginning with the edition of 1659, in *Poems* attributed to Cleveland.) The poem not only illustrates the practice of stringing together epigrams on one subject, but because of both subject and treatment is sufficiently close to Dingley's poem to suggest the latter may even have been inspired by it, though Fletcher's poem is not pure Martial, but a "conceit" on Martial's epigrams:

Vpon a Flye that flew into a Lady's eye, and there lay buried in a tear.

Poor envious *Soul*! what couldst thou see
In that bright *Orb* of puritie?
That active globe? That twinkling sphear
Of beauty to be medling there?
Or didst thou foolishly mistake
The glowing morn in that day-break?
Or was't thy pride to mount so high
Only to kisse the *Sun* and dye?

known to us, of an entire poem of considerable length, not too unskilfully composed, which consists of consecutive epigrams on one subject. Presumably it was composed on the theory (if the author theorized about it at all) that such a sequence of stanzas would attain a heightened effect through cumulative force. Although it might have been said of Dingley, as Dryden said of Fletcher the dramatist, that "he

Or didst thou think to rival all
Don Phaethon and his great fall?
And in a richer Sea of brine
Drown *Icarus* again in thine?
Twas bravely aim'd, and which is more
Th' hast sunck the fable ore and ore.
For in this single death of thee
Th' hast banqurrupt all *Antiquitie.*
O had the fair *Ægiptian* Queen
Thy glorious monument out* seen,
How had she spared what time forbids
The needlesse tott'ring *Pyramids*!
And in an emulative chafe
Have begg'd thy shrine her Epitaph?
Where, when her aged marble must
Resigne her honour to the dust,
Thou mightst have canonized her
Deceased *Time's Executor*?
To ripp up all the western bed
Of spices where *Sol* layes his head,
To squeeze the *Phœnix* and her Nest
In one perfume that may write *Best*,
Then blend the gall'rie of the skyes
With her *Seraglio* of eyes,
T' embalm a name, and raise a Tombe
The miracle of all to come,
Then, then compare it: Here's a Gemm
A Pearl must shame and pitty them.
An amber drop, distlled by
The sparkling *Limbeck* of an eye,
Shall dazle all the short essaies
Of rubbish worth, and shallow praise.
We strive not then to prize that tear
Since we have nought to poise it here.
The world's too light, Hence, hence we cry
The world, the world's not worth a Fly.

(Pp. 185–86)

* Misprint for "but."

is a true Englishman; he knows not when to give over," [1] Dingley's practice is in accord with that of many seventeenth-century writers. In stringing out his figures, then, Dingley was old-fashioned rather than modern. His delight in elaborating the matter is akin to the academic practice of ringing as many changes as possible on a single idea expressed in one line of verse, which — thanks originally to cloistered leisure and, before the introduction of printing, a paucity of books — is made to yield hundreds if not thousands of variant lines.[2] When Pope, on the other hand, contemplated Martial's bee in amber, he was as summary as Herrick. That he did not especially admire the conceit may be supposed from his having used it for purposes of ridicule:

> Pretty! in Amber to observe the forms
> Of hairs, or straws, or dirt, or grubs, or worms;
> The things, we know, are neither rich nor rare,
> But wonder how the Devil they got there? [3]

This is no proper epigram. Like most of Pope's verse, however, it has the compression, if it lacks the "conceit" or surprising turn, of epigrammatic writing at its best. Pope, though he has here allowed himself a quatrain, notably strove for condensation of thoughts in distichs. This is that "epigrammatic" style for which he has been celebrated, often without very clear recognition of the relation of "epigrammatic" to *the epigram*.[4] Among Pope's works are but few genuine epi-

[1] The "Defence of the Epilogue" to the Second Part of *The Conquest of Granada* (1672).

[2] The "Protean" line furnishes the most striking example. The order of words of a single verse (or distich) was altered as many times as possible without violating meter or sense. Bernard Bauhuis, a French Jesuit, offered a line, "*Tot sibi sunt dotes, Virgo, quot sidera cœlo*," from which 1,022 variants were made and published in a work entitled *Pietatis Thaumata in Proteum parthenicum unius libri versum, et unius versus librum* (Antwerp, 1617). To this Burton alluded in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*: "And rather than do nothing, vary a verse a thousand waies with Putean, so torturing his wits, or as Rainnerus of Luneburge, 2,150 times in his 'Proteus Poeticus,' or Scaliger, Chrysolithus, Cleppisus, and others have in like sort done." (II, ii, iv; 6th ed. [1651], pp. 285–86.)

[3] *Epistle . . . to Dr. Arbuthnot* (1734), p. 9.

[4] The use of the distich was, of course, time out of mind characteristic of epigrammatic writing, the distich being sometimes the whole epigram — a practice favored, for instance, by James Wright and exemplified in his *Sales Epigrammatum* (1663) — sometimes merely the cracker at the end of a series of verses. Cf. Wright's remarks "To the Reader": "*Generally in Epigrams of six, eight, or ten verses, the Salt, the Conceipt of all is referred to a Distick in the end, and there expressed: Thus you see Disticks in general, are* Sales Epigrammatum."

grams.[1] Pope preferred Boileau's way. True, he loved the brilliant flashes in successive distichs. But whereas the epigrammatists contented themselves with miniatures complete in and for themselves, Pope refused to tarry over one small bit of ground, like a dancer pirouetting ever in the same place, but conscious always of the "design, form, fable," progressed steadily from one position to the next.

From the point of view of a Hobbes or a Locke, Dingley is plainly a writer of "wit" rather than of "judgment;" for he seeks resemblances and congruities, instead of distinguishing and separating ideas. Johnson, in his famous passage upon the metaphysical poets, said that they were "men of learning, and to shew their learning was their whole endeavour." There is no one so willing to show his learning as the schoolboy poet, particularly one trained to believe that these learned metaphors are witty. Dingley, like many of his predecessors, indulges not so much in the false wit of mere verbal felicity as in "conceit" of idea. He therefore comes into the category of the "metaphysical" poets defined by Dr. Johnson and by him assigned a relatively low place on the slopes of Parnassus.[2]

There is a striking passage in De Quincey's essay on *Rhetoric*, however, which is especially pertinent here. De Quincey distinguishes Eloquence and Rhetoric in the following somewhat idiosyncratic way:

By Eloquence we understand the overflow of powerful feelings upon occasions fitted to excite them. But Rhetoric is the art of aggrandizing and

[1] The best example that can be alleged from Pope is possibly that called, simply, "Epigram":

> A gold watch found on cinder whore,
> Or a good verse on J[emm]y M[oor]e,
> Proves but what either should conceal,
> Not that they're rich, but that they steal. (*Works*, IV, [1882], 443.)

[2] Johnson's description fits Dingley rather neatly. It will be recalled that Johnson accused the metaphysical poets of seeking to be "singular in their thoughts . . . Their thoughts are often new, but seldom natural." They cultivated "a combination of dissimilar images, or discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike," so that "the most heterogeneous ideas are yoked by violence together; nature and art are ransacked for illustrations, comparisons, and allusions." But they lacked "that comprehension and expanse of thought which at once fills the whole mind . . . Sublimity is produced by aggregation, and littleness by dispersion. . . . Those writers . . . broke every image into fragments; and could no more represent, by their slender conceits and laboured particularities, the prospects of nature, or the scenes of life, than he, who dissects a sun-beam with a prism, can exhibit the wide effulgence of a summer noon." (Life of Cowley.)

bringing out into strong relief, by means of various and striking thoughts, some aspect of truth which of itself is supported by no spontaneous feelings, and therefore rests upon artificial aids.[1]

De Quincey says further, in the same essay:

Omitting Sir Philip Sidney, and omitting his friend, Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke . . . the first very eminent rhetorician in the English Literature is Donne. Dr. Johnson inconsiderately classes him in company with Cowley, &c., under the title of *Metaphysical* Poets: metaphysical they were not; *Rhetorical* would have been a more accurate designation. In saying *that*, however, we must remind our readers that we revert to the original use of the word *Rhetoric*, as laying the principal stress upon the management of the thoughts, and only a secondary one upon the ornaments of style. . . .[2] The artifice and machinery of rhetoric furnishes in its degree as legitimate a basis for intellectual pleasure as any other; that the pleasure is of an inferior order, can no more attaint the idea or model of the composition than it can impeach the excellence of an epigram that it is not a tragedy.[3]

Had De Quincey written with Dingley's poem in mind, he could hardly have summarized the situation more happily. It is precisely the absence of emotion, and the trick of "aggrandizing and bringing out into strong relief" an aspect of truth, by means of "artificial aids," that characterize this composition. As rhetoric, then, in De Quincey's rather specialized meaning, the poem must be judged.

Let us sum up our observations concerning "Upon a Bee Entomb'd in Amber" and the implications of its appearance in a collection issued by a recent collegian in the year of grace 1694. First, we have seen how thoroughly, here and there, the epigram (and the emblem, a re-

[1] *The Collected Writings of Thomas de Quincey*, ed. David Masson (1889–90), X, 92.

[2] Cf. Bacon: "The duty & office of Rhetoric is to apply Reason to Imagination for the better moving of the will [of the auditor]." (*Advancement of Learning*, in *Works*, ed. Spedding, III [1857], 409.) It is significant that Bacon dismissed from the poetry to which he gave serious attention "Satires, Elegies, Epigrams, Odes, & the like," which he referred "to philosophy and arts of speech." (*De Augmentis*, II, 13; in *Works*, IV [1858], 315.)

[3] *The Collected Writings of Thomas de Quincey*, X, 100–101. Cf. also: "Weak criticism, indeed, is that which condemns a copy of verses under the ideal of poetry, when the mere substitution of another name and classification suffices to evade the sentence, and to reinstate the composition in its rights as rhetoric. It may be very true that the age of Donne gave too much encouragement to his particular vein of composition. That, however, argues no depravity of taste, but a taste erring only in being too limited and exclusive." (*Ibid.*, pp. 101–2.)

lated form) had permeated the writing of other types of poetry. Second, we have seen that the "conceit" in its worst forms, based upon a theory of wit which emphasized novelty, surprise, verbal ingenuity, and the linking of apparently incongruous ideas, was actually cultivated in the grammar schools of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Third, we have seen that this theory of wit had some, if not much, critical support; though rather it existed merely as an element of confusion in critical thinking upon the topic. Fourth, we have seen that although sane writers of the eighteenth century threw overboard this false and mixed wit, with its progeny of conceits, those very writers retained the polish, conciseness, antithesis, and even some of the ingenuity which had been developed by two centuries of epigram-writing inside and outside the schoolroom. Finally, we have seen some grounds for De Quincey's suggestion that those we call "metaphysical" poets were often only "rhetorical" poets.

"Timon's Villa" and Cannons

By GEORGE SHERBURN

ABOUT the middle of December, 1731, Alexander Pope published the poem which later became the fourth of his "Moral Essays." At first it was called *An Epistle to the Right Honourable Richard Earl of Burlington. Occasion'd by his Publishing Palladio's Designs of the Baths, Arches, Theatres, &c. of Ancient Rome.* The subject of the poem, as the half-title indicated, was "Of Taste," or according to the third edition, "Of False Taste." Its central idea might naturally have been taken from the Italian preface to Burlington's *Fabbriche antiche disegnate da Andrea Palladio Vicentino* (London, 1730), where this early-eighteenth-century arbiter of architectural (not linguistic!) elegances says of Palladio:

Non posso alla fine, far a men d'asserire che gli studj di sì grand' Uomo debbano essere tanto più stimabili, quanto opportunissimo Presente all' Età nostra, di cui niun' altra forse dimostrò mai maggiore disposizione a dispendiose Fabbriche; nè produsse più ignoranti Pretenditori che guidano altrui fuor delle vere Traccie di tanto bell' Arte.

In discussing Pope's *Epistle*, ever since its publication, commentators have somewhat neglected this theme in favor of the alleged scandal involving Pope in a wanton attack on one of his supposed benefactors, James Brydges, first Duke of Chandos.

Lines 99–176 of the standard text of the poem [1] recount the tasteless magnificence which the poet experienced in a visit, real or fictitious, to "Timon's villa." From the day of publication to the present, it has generally been agreed that this "villa" was Cannons, seat of the Duke of Chandos. Such an opinion was natural; for this new palace, near Edgware, was outstanding among the *dispendiose fabbriche* near London, and some lines in Pope's satire, and certainly the general theme,

[1] Pope's *Works*, ed. Whitwell Elwin and W. J. Courthope (London, 1871–89), III, 179–83. Unless otherwise stated all further references here to Pope's *Works* are to this edition.

might easily suggest Cannons — though specific information about the place is strangely lacking. In the letter books of the first Duke of Chandos,[1] there are copies of one or two letters written by the Duke indicating that Pope had expressed to His Grace a considerable annoyance at the persistent identification of Timon and Chandos, and copies of many other letters indicating on the part of His Grace close friendship, not with Pope, to be sure, but with such intimate friends of Pope as Dr. Arbuthnot, Lord Bathurst, Viscount Bolingbroke, and the Earl of Burlington himself. These friendships of the Duke with Pope's friends seem to the present writer to make it highly improbable that the possibility of the Timon-Chandos identification ever occurred to Pope before the poem was published. The story is complex, but, considering the importance of the poem and of the work done by both Pope and Burlington[2] in correcting the taste of their day and in relegating rococo art to a comparatively minor role in England, it is well worth rehearsing.

I

Pope's poem was advertised in the *Daily Post* for December 13, 1731, as published on that day. The subject of his satire — the "false sublime" of the great in building and gardening — was somewhat loftier than that which had occupied him in his last poem, the *Dunciad*; hence Pope doubtless expected a rather more genteel reception for his work. But his "dunces" were lying in wait for him, and against the lines on Timon's villa the outcry was instantaneous. For some weeks Pope had to be active in self-defense. The printed attacks on the poem, which were fairly numerous, came chiefly from enemies whom he had pilloried in the *Dunciad*, and to these he hardly replied.[3] The

[1] Now in the Huntington Library.

[2] See the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, October 15, 1927 (pp. 675–93) and November 12, 1927 (pp. 14–16), for Dr. Fiske Kimball's "Burlington Architectus," and *ibid.*, November 26, 1927 (pp. 45–46), for Sir Reginald Blomfield's comment. Whether Burlington was his own draughtsman or not, his great influence cannot be doubted. There are drawings traditionally ascribed to him in the collections at Chatsworth, in addition to those in the collections of the R. I. B. A. Pope's influence is usually discussed on the basis of Horace Walpole's essay "On Modern Gardening," which probably exaggerates Pope's nevertheless very real influence.

[3] The advertising that preceded the publication of Savage's (and Pope's?) *A Collection of Pieces in Verse and Prose, Which have been publish'd on Occasion of the Dunciad* (on sale to-

first outcry, however, must have been oral rather than printed, and it may have been voiced by persons of importance,[1] whose opinions are difficult to trace. The promptness of this oral attack is inferred from the promptness of Pope's defense. In the *Daily Post-Boy* for December 22, 1731, appeared a long letter with the caption "To J. G. Esq." It was neither dated nor signed; it contained obvious misprints; and it had appended to it a considerable postscript. In the *Daily Journal*[2] for the next day this material was reprinted in leading position, with this introduction:

> The following Letters having been incorrectly printed in a Daily Paper Yesterday, and the one being subjoined to the other as a Postscript from the same Hand, it was thought necessary to reprint them in this Paper correctly and separately, as they should be.

These two letters (the postscript now forming the second) were dated respectively December 16 and 19, but they were still unsigned. Naturally people assumed that Pope was the anonymous author, but, when he included the first of the letters in some (not all) of the editions of his correspondence, he placed it among letters to John Gay, and it was there signed W. C., the initials doubtless of his friend William Cleland. If Pope did not write these letters, he pretty certainly supervised their composition; and since it is palpable that he revised the text of the

wards the end of January, 1731/2) would arouse the "dunces," but the *Collection* did not concern the *Epistle to Burlington*. It is worth remark that the *Grub-street Journal*, thought to be Pope's personal organ, displays no interest in defending him from the early attacks developing from Timon's villa. On January 13, 1731/2, it jeers at false Latin in the title-page of Welsted's verses *Of Dulness and Scandal*, but this is about all that has been noted that might concern Timon.

[1] That the attacks came mainly from unimportant people, who were noisy, seems to be the view expressed by Lady Betty Germain in a letter of January 11, 1731/2 (see Ball's edition of Swift's *Correspondence*, IV [London, 1913], 279); by the Earl of Orrery in a letter of December 27, 1731 (see *Historical MSS. Commission: Dartmouth MSS.*, I, 327–28), as well as by Bolingbroke in his later "Letter to Mr. Pope" (in the volume called *A Letter to Sir William Windham*, etc. [1753], pp. 432–33). See also Pope's letter to the Earl of Oxford, January 22, 1731/2, in his *Works*, VIII, 292. The first printed attack that I have noted came from that servant of dulness, John Henley, in his *Hyp-Doctor*, December 21, 1731.

[2] J. R. Robinson, in *The Princely Chandos* (London, 1893), p. 171, quotes the first of the two letters as found in the *Daily Courant*, December 23, 1731 — where it certainly is not to be found. He also errs in saying that there it has subjoined to it a letter hostile to Pope — which he quotes from some unknown source.

one published in his correspondence before printing it there, and since the letter so perfectly states his defensive position with regard to Timon's villa, the text of the *Daily Journal* may be quoted for one passage:

Why, in God's Name, must a *Portrait*, apparently collected from 20 different Men, be apply'd to one only? Has it his *Eye*? No, it is very unlike. Has it his *Nose* or *Mouth*? No, they are totally differing. What then, I beseech you? Why, it has the *Mole on his Chin*. Very well; but must the Picture therefore be his, and has no other Man that Blemish? Would to God I had it, together with his Magnificence, Beneficence, Generosity, and Goodness! Then I would add one Vanity more to the Catalogue, and firmly believe myself the best Man of my Age and Country, because I have *honour'd my God* with most Dignity, and done most *Good* to my *Neighbour*.

The companion letter in the *Daily Journal* sounds like Pope also; and, since it is brief and is interesting in certain details, it richly deserves what may be its first reprinting since 1731:

Dec. 19

SIR,

I Really cannot help smiling at the Stupidity, while I lament the slanderous Temper, of the Town. I thought no Mortal singly could claim that Character of *Timon*, any more than any Man pretend to be Sir *John Falstaff*.

But the Application of it to the D. of Ch. is monstrous; to a Person who in *every Particular* differs from it. 'Is his Garden crowded with *Walls*? Are 'his Trees cut into *Figures of Men*? Do his Basons want *Water*? Are there *ten* '*steep Slopes* of his Terrass? Is he piqued about *Editions* of *Books*? Does he 'exclude all *Moderns* from his *Library*? Is the *Musick* of his Chapel bad, or '*whimsical*, or *jiggish*? On the contrary, was it not the best composed in the 'Nation, and most suited to grave Subjects; witness *Nicol. Haym*'s and Mr. '*Hendel*'s Noble *Oratories*? Has it the Pictures of naked Women in it? And 'did ever Dean Ch-w-d preach his Courtly Sermons there? I am sick of such 'Fool-Applications.

The writer (possibly Pope?) does not deny that some details in Timon's villa might fit Cannons; it was hardly possible for him to do that. He demands, defensively, if these details fit no other estate also? He points out emphatically — what no one has ever denied — that some details in Timon's villa could not possibly fit Cannons; and he is most complimentary to the good qualities of the Duke of Chan-

dos. This constitutes Pope's line of defense, of which the unfriendly William Lisle Bowles exclaimed: "All this is equivocation: the Duke of Chandos's grounds and house were described *so* particularly, that no one ever did and could mistake." [1] But Bowles is hardly just, and his statement is hardly true. Pope's prompt activity shows an undoubted desire to persuade the public that he was not attacking Chandos, and a desire also to stress features of Timon's villa that could not be seen at Cannons. He had, as we shall see, personal reasons for mentioning favorably "Mr. *Hendel*'s Noble *Oratories*."

Apart from these two letters in the *Daily Journal* and the further letter to Burlington prefixed to the third edition of the poem (published January 27, 1731/2), the most interesting early defense is a hitherto quite unnoted publication in a newspaper of a poetic fragment that, without much change, was incorporated three years later in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*.[2] They were printed, without introduction or other comment, in the *London Evening Post*, January 22–25, 1731/2, as follows:

HORACE, *Sat.* 4. *Lib.* I. *paraphras'd.*
Inscribed to the Hon. Mr. ——.

———— 1 *Absentem* qui rodit Amicum:
2 Qui non *defendit*, alio culpante: 3 Solutos
Qui captat *Risus* hominum, *Famamque dicacis*:
4 Fingere qui *non visa* potest: 5 *Commissa tacere*
Qui nequit: — Hic *Niger* est: Hunc, tu Romane, caveto.

1 The *Fop*, whose Pride affects a *Patron's* Name,
Yet *absent*, wounds an Author's honest Fame;
2 That more abusive Fool, who calls me *Friend*
Yet wants the Honour, injur'd to defend:
3 Who spreads a *Tale*, a *Libel* hands about,
Enjoys the *Jest*, and copies *Scandal* out:
4 Who to the *Dean* and *Silver Bell* can swear,
And sees at *C-n-ns* what was never there:
5 Who tells you all I *mean*, and all I *say*;
And, if he *lies* not, must at least *betray*:
'Tis not the *Sober Sat'rist* you should dread,
But such a *babling Coxcomb* in his Stead.

[1] *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Bowles (London, 1806), VIII, 230 n.
[2] *Works*, III, 264 (ll. 291–304).

Who the "Hon. Mr. ——" may have been is a matter of conjecture; in 1732 he was perhaps any "Honourable" who could see the invisible at Cannons. By 1735 he was John, Lord Hervey, as the context of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* shows.

Pope's published and official position is, then, clear and not equivocal. It was difficult to reply to charges made as gossip that continually shifted its ground. This fact limited the success of Pope's defense. Interestingly enough, he is found taking the same "line" in his private correspondence of these weeks, which, though not extensive, is fully as important as his published defense. Among the letters found in his collected *Works* are two addressed to Aaron Hill, first published in 1751 in a *Collection of Letters* written by Hill and others. Pope wrote to Hill (December 22, 1731) most emphatically:

> if there be truth in the world, I declare to you, I never imagined the least application of what I said of Timon could be made to the Duke of Chandos, than whom there is scarce a more blameless, worthy, and generous, beneficent character, among all our nobility: and if I have not lost my senses, the town has lost them, by what I heard so late, as but two days ago, of the uproar on this head. I am certain, if you calmly read every particular of that description, you will find almost all of them point blank the reverse of that person's *villa*. It is an awkward thing for a man to print, in defence of his own work, against a chimera; you know not who, or what you fight against: the objections start up in a new shape, like the armies and phantoms of magicians, and no weapon can cut a mist or a shadow.[1]

This passage is curiously like other letters by Pope, and like the letter just quoted from the *Daily Journal — of the following day*. Six weeks later (February 5, 1731/2) Pope is again defending himself to Hill:

> I will only just tell you, that many circumstances you have heard, as resemblances to the picture of Timon, are utterly inventions of liars; the number of servants never was a hundred, the paintings not of Verrio or Laguerre, but Bellucci and Zeeman; no such buffet, manner of reception at the study, terrace, &c.: all which, and many more, they have not scrupled to forge, to gain some credit to the application; and (which is worse) belied testimonies of noblemen, and of my particular friends, to condemn me. In a word, the malice is as great as the dulness of my calumniators.[2]

[1] *Ibid.*, X, 42.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

These passages have been known but neglected. Letters that passed between Pope and the principals in the case — the Earl of Burlington and the Duke of Chandos — have never been printed. That which Pope addressed to Burlington in the first excitement of his discovery that Timon was being misapplied, has been preserved at Chatsworth, and is here first printed with the kind permission of the Duke of Devonshire:

Twitenham Decr 21.

My Lord,

Having been confined at home for ten days, by my Mothers being in extreme danger, I never heard till two days since of a most Extravagant Censure wch they say ye whole Town passes upon ye Epistle I honourd myself in addressing to your Ldship, as if it were intended to expose the D. of Chandos. Either the whole Town then, or I, have lost our Senses; for nothing is so evident, to any one who can read ye Language, either of English or Poetry, as that Character of Timon is collected from twenty different Absurditys & Improprieties: & was never ye Picture of any one Human Creature. The Argument is short. Either the Duke these folks would abuse, *did* all those things, or he *did not.* If he did, he wd deserve to be laughd at with a Vengeance; and if he did *not,* then it's plain it cannot be the Duke: and the latter is really the case.

I beg to know what are yr Ldships Sentiments, yt I shd do in this unaccountable affair? I hope You are not abused too, because I meant just ye Contrary; I can't tell, but I fancy your Ldship is not so Easy to be persuaded contrary to yr Senses, even tho ye whole Town & Court too should require it. I doubt not ye Justice, the more than justice, you will do me, on this or any other Injury: but I really want to know yr Thoughts of it, being (as I perceive) a Man out of ye World, & delirious: but still my dear Ld with understanding enough to Love and Adhere to you.

Yrs ever faithfully,
A Pope

This seems to be sufficiently direct. Burlington and Pope were friends of twenty years' standing, and the poem probably had been submitted to the Earl's revision before publication. The question raised in the letter is simply, What is to be done in view of this insane identification of Timon's villa?

One obvious course of action would be to address apologies to the injured Duke, and Pope did send His Grace two letters, neither of

which has ever been printed. Their present existence is doubtful. But in the Chandos letter books we have a copy of the Duke's reply to one of them, from which we can form an idea of Pope's apology and of its reception. The reader should remember that, in spite of Chandos' subscription to the *Iliad*, the two men were practically strangers. The Duke wrote as follows:

Cannons 27th. Decr. 1731

Sir —

I am much troubled to find by Your favour of ye 22d You are under any uneasiness, at ye application ye Town has made of Timon's Character, in Your Epistle to ye Earl of Burlinton. For my own part I have recd. so many instances of ye will they bear me, that I am as little surprized as I am affected with this further proof of it; It would indeed be a real concern to me, did I beleive One of your Judgment had designedly given grounds for their imbibing an Opinion, so disadvantageous of me. But as Your obliging Letter, is sufficient to free me from this apprehension, I can with great indifference bear ye insults they bestow, and not find myself hurt by 'em: nor have I reason to be much disturb'd, when I consider how many better persons are ye daily objects of their unjust censures.

I heartily lament ye Melancholly condition You are in on account of ye approaching loss, of so near and tender a Relation; Such strokes of Providence are great tryals of humane Nature, and exercise its utmost Fortitude, but they proceed from ye hand of One, whose power wee cannot resist, and whose will, it is our Duty to submit to: I need not I am confident enlarge on this subject to One, whose words have instructed many, and who hath so often upholden him that was falling, Religion and his own good Sense, will enable him to avoid ye reproach that follows; but now it is come upon thee and thou faintest, is this thy confidence and thy Hope? —

I earnestly wish you may soon be restored to that quiet of Mind You have hitherto possest, and without wch. no happiness can be enjoy'd. I am

Sir Your &c [1]

His Grace's unsurprised acceptance of the animosity of the town will seem strange to those who know him only as Dr. Johnson has described him.[2] Chandos was not a popular hero. In 1711, when the Tories were in their early flush of victory, it had been charged that

[1] Letter Books, XXXIX, 32.

[2] *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), III, 152.

Mr. Paymaster General Brydges was short in his accounts; and, though good Tories like Bathurst and Bolingbroke defended him, it was, naturally enough, several years after the Peace of Utrecht before these accounts could be finally settled. Meanwhile, Mr. Brydges' enormous wealth was an object of popular suspicion. He was created Earl of Carnarvon by George I in 1714, and advanced to be Duke of Chandos in 1719. Though accepting these honors, he declined various public employments and repeatedly even refused to allow books to be dedicated to him — "having alwaies desired to avoid these kinds of publick notice," [1] so he wrote in friendly refusal to Nicholas Rowe in 1718. Years of this self-effacement failed to win him popularity. He was much annoyed, for example, in the summer of 1728 by gossip and by newspaper items concerning his financial instability. He writes to a friend:

> What you mention about the Report which was so industriously spread about the Town relating to the Dutchess of Marlborough's having made a Seizure upon me, is so wholly without any foundation, that I am surprised how it cou'd run so current as it did; & am persuaded it was raised with the utmost malice & propagated with no less industry . . . however it is not very material, such Reports are but of nine days wonder, and when so totally false, dye away of themselves.[2]

But the reports continued, and he was forced to consider prosecuting two newspapers. Within the month, the Duchess of Marlborough advertised the falseness of the report. There was probably no time in the Duke of Chandos' career when he felt that he had (as Dr. Johnson said) "the voice of the publick in his favour." Johnson was, however, very likely right in saying Chandos was "of a temper kind and beneficent."

His letter books in general give the impression of containing the correspondence of a man with little or no malice or subtlety in his nature: to him such a remark as that with which the letter to Pope closes — about Pope's "quiet of Mind" — is probably without *arrière pensée*. Consequently, we must believe that he seems to accept Pope's letter as sufficient apology. But it might naturally be true that a

[1] Letter Books, XV, 164.
[2] *Ibid.*, XXXII, 72. (To Mr. More of Queen Square, July 19, 1728.)

month later, when the outcry was still hideous, he would begin to feel that, with others so very certain of Pope's malice towards him, it was perhaps naïve to accept unreservedly the poet's professions of innocence. His immediate reaction was at least dignified and gracious, and hardly justifies Dr. Johnson's second sentence on the subject. In his life of Pope, Johnson says:

> He [Pope] wrote an exculpatory letter to the Duke, which was answered with great magnanimity, as by a man who accepted his excuse without believing his professions. He said, that to have ridiculed his taste or his buildings had been an indifferent action in another man, but that in Pope, after the reciprocal kindness that had been exchanged between them, it had been less easily excused.[1]

Chandos does not mention any kindnesses of the past between himself and Pope, and his alleged disbelief of Pope's professions cannot be deduced from the text of the letter.

It is consequently interesting to see if the Duke's letter books contain further correspondence on this subject. There is at least one letter, addressed to his friend Anthony Hammond on January 1, 1732, four days after the letter to Pope was written. The part that concerns us reads:

> I make no question but You have heard of Timon's Character in Pope's Epistle to Lord Burlington. Y^e^ town has ascribed it to me, and I am not so ignorant of my own weakness, as not to be sensible of it's Justness in some particulars, but I have rec^d^ from y^e^ Author 2 Letters on this subject, in w^ch^ he utterly denies, that I was y^e^ object he had in view, or that he had any manner of design to paint me out, in y^e^ light that description gives; I find by y^e^ Advertisements M^r^ Welsted is publishing some remarks upon it, I have reason to flatter my self, from y^e^ friendship he has profest, he intends me no harm, but I should be very sorry, if he endeavour'd on my account to hurt M^r^ Pope. I know not where to send to him my self, but as he is a particular acquaint-a[n]ce of Yours, — You may perhaps know where he lodges, & I desire You'l acquaint him I make it my request, that he will forbear printing any thing, on my behalf, that may tend to y^e^ prejudice of a Person, who from what he has wrote, I ought to beleive neither hath nor had any ill will towards me. Your friendship in this will much oblige
>
> Sir Your &c[2]

[1] *Lives of the English Poets*, III, 153.

[2] Letter Books, XXXIX, 43–44.

Welsted's professions of friendship had begun at least by 1720, with *An Epistle to His Grace the Duke of Chandos*. It was now too late to forestall his advertised remarks on Pope's poem; they appeared on January 3 in a poem entitled *Of Dulness and Scandal. Occasion'd by the Character of Lord Timon*. Apart from the title, Welsted's epistle contains no mention of Timon or his villa, but it significantly celebrates "Pollio" as a recent victim of Pope's rage and malice. In the letter to Hammond, Chandos is still dignified and correct. He sees that Timon's villa might in some details be a just criticism of Cannons, but he concludes, with seeming sincerity, that Pope ought not to be attacked on account of Timon's villa: since "from what he has wrote, I ought to beleive [he] neither hath not had any ill will towards me." If the town had not been so sure of Pope's intentions, the Duke would probably have been satisfied with his apologies. But the "dunces" were too noisy.[1] What His Grace naturally most desired was a cessation of the unpleasant publicity caused by Pope's poem; but for months poems, prose pamphlets, and prints (the most famous example of the last being Hogarth's "Taste") continued to comment on Pope's lack of taste and of a decent gratitude in attacking his former benefactor, the Duke of Chandos. In fact, Pope's portrait of Addison (Atticus) and his account of Timon's villa form the foundation of the tradition that he was treacherous and ungrateful to his friends.

II

It becomes necessary to examine the relations of the Duke with Pope and his friends in the years preceding the *Epistle to Burlington*. Was the poet ungrateful? Of the Duke's relations with Pope the story

[1] At first sight, Chandos seems in his letter books to have had associations with a suspicious number of Pope's "dunces." Welsted, however, is the only one who had anything like a continued regard from the Duke, and it is not too clear that Welsted was not simply pertinacious. His lodgings and address are unknown to the Duke. Oldmixon for some years had been in His Grace's employ at Bridgwater, but in 1728 they had parted company, the Duke being dissatisfied with Oldmixon's careless keeping of accounts, etc. (Oldmixon was customs officer at Bridgwater.) Chandos long had business relations of a minor sort with various Theobalds, possibly relatives of Pope's Prince of Dulness. On January 28, 1732, he subscribed "with great pleasure" for four sets of Lewis Theobald's edition of Shakespeare (Letter Books, XXXIX, 71), and this act, six weeks after the *Epistle to Burlington*, is certainly suspicious. But four sets is not a significantly large number for Chandos: he had subscribed for 50 copies of Gay's *Poems* in 1720.

should be short; for in replying to reiterated charges of ingratitude to the Duke, especially those made by Welsted in *Of Dulness and Scandal*, Pope made the following statement in a footnote to line 357 [1] of the first edition of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*:

> *Welsted*'s *Lye*.] This Man had the Impudence to tell in print, that Mr. *P.* had occasion'd a *Lady's death*, and to *name* a person he never heard of. He also publish'd that he had libell'd the Duke of *Chandos*; with whom (it was added) that he had liv'd in familiarity, and receiv'd from him a Present of *five hundred pounds:* The Falsehood of which is known to his Grace, whom Mr. *P.* never had the honour to see but *twice*, and never receiv'd any Present farther than the Subscription for *Homer*, from him, or from Any Great Man whatsoever.

In later editions Pope omitted the clause "whom Mr. *P.* never had the honour to see but *twice*," but he still denied any familiar acquaintance with or present from the Duke. It would seem, then, that if Pope had attacked Chandos no question of ingratitude should have arisen. Two plausible excuses for the charge may have been known to Welsted and the other "dunces." Chandos was, as we shall see, very intimate with some of Pope's best friends, and hence the "dunces" may have wrongly assumed close ties between Pope and the Duke. Secondly, there was the printed evidence in the list of subscribers to the *Iliad* that the Earl of Carnarvon had subscribed for 12 sets — two more than anyone else was put down for — and in Pope's Preface to the work Carnarvon had received gracious thanks along with other subscribers and promoters of this literary and financial undertaking: "I could say a great deal of the Pleasure of being distinguish'd by the *Earl* of *Carnarvon*, but it is almost absurd to particularize any one generous Action in a Person whose whole Life is a continued Series of them." This sentence is hardly prophetic of Timon's villa! The burden of discovering when and why Pope changed his attitude (if he did) should be upon those who identify Chandos and Timon.

Pope may have had the honor to see Chandos more than twice, but in spite of the subscription to the *Iliad* no intimacy between the two seems to have developed. The subscription was made fairly late (January 9, 1715), when subscribing had become fashionable. It was

[1] Line 375 in standard editions.

secured through Pope's close friend the Hon. Simon Harcourt, whose father was intimate with Chandos. The Duke's letter [1] expressing his desire to subscribe is addressed to Harcourt, and implies an acquaintance with Pope's genius through the report of friends rather than through personal contact. The letter also indicates that His Grace paid no more than the regular subscription earnest of two guineas a set. That he took all the sets subscribed for "to oblidge some friends" seems probable from a letter written by him to Madam Kilmansegge, to whom in 1718 a domestic of the Duke's had sent Volume IV, thus crudely defeating the Duke's desire to place the volume in her "fair hands" himself.[2] The transaction over the *Iliad*, then, was purely businesslike, and in it Pope's only part was the acceptance of the regular subscription price of 72 guineas and the making of a very gracious acknowledgment to his top subscriber in his Preface. Probably this transaction was, however, the basis of the story that Chandos had given Pope £500 — a story that Pope denied.

One other small bit of evidence that there was no close acquaintance between Pope and Chandos may be gleaned from the Duke's letter books. On January 21, 1719/20 His Grace wrote to Dr. Arbuthnot concerning an estate, the purchase of which from Edward Blount, Esq., was under consideration. It is significant that Chandos does not approach Pope directly. He writes: "I have another matter to trouble you about, which is to desire you will speak to M^r^ Pope to ask M^r^ Blunt (of whom he is a great Acquaintance & Friend) whether he is willing to part w^th^ a small Estate he hath near Bps Castle." One judges Pope may have performed this commission; for later the estate, though for sale, was pronounced by His Grace to be too dear.[3]

The next record concerning the relations of Pope and the Duke is the fact that in 1722 Pope sent a copy of Parnell's *Poems* (which Pope had just edited), inscribed "To His Grace, The Duke of Chandois, from His most obedient, obliged and humble Servant, A. Pope" — an inscription which in its perfect formality might mean either little or much.[4]

[1] Printed (from the Letter Books) in my *Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), p. 139 n.

[2] Letter Books, XV, 314–15.

[3] *Ibid.*, XVI, 445–46, and XVII, 47.

[4] The book was sold at Sotheby's, July 28, 1927.

There is yet another curiously unexplored link between Pope and Cannons. This is Handel's first oratorio, *Esther*, which was composed in the summer of 1720 for performance at Cannons. A little earlier Handel had composed for the same stage *Acis and Galatea*, on a libretto by John Gay. The book for *Esther* — called in 1720 *Haman and Mordecai* — was apparently by Pope, who probably wrote it out of kindness to Handel's early patron, Lord Burlington, possibly in collaboration with Dr. Arbuthnot,[1] who was a frequent adviser to the Duke of Chandos on musical matters. The oratorio was produced at Cannons probably in the continental fashion for "sacred dramas," with stage action and decor. It was very likely performed there but once, and afterwards nothing was heard of it for a dozen years.

Then, surprisingly enough, about ten weeks after the publication of the *Epistle to Burlington* — at a moment when the town rang with the alleged ingratitude of Pope to Chandos — this forgotten piece "writ by Pope, and composed by Hendel" was revived. The occasion was the composer's forty-seventh birthday, and the promoter is said to have been Bernard Gates, devoted disciple of Handel and choirmaster of the Chapel Royal. The Earl of Egmont recorded the performance in his *Diary* (February 23, 1731/2):

> From dinner I went to the Music Club, where the King's Chapel boys acted the *History of Hester*, writ by Pope, and composed by Hendel. This oratoria or religious opera is exceeding fine, and the company were highly pleased, some of the parts being well performed.[2]

There was at least one other private performance, and on April 20 came the first public performance, advertised in the newspapers, usu-

[1] The British Museum *Catalogue* ascribes it to Dr. Arbuthnot and also to Pope. The earliest ascription of it to the Doctor is apparently found in a Dublin edition of 1757, which I have not seen. A London edition of the same year carries no indication of the authorship of the words. In the Preface to the oratorio *Omnipotence* (2d ed.; 1774) it is said that Arbuthnot and Pope translated Handel's German words into English; but internal evidence indicates a priority for the English text. Further evidence is desirable; but that given here from the period of the oratorio's first public performance is overwhelmingly in favor of Pope's authorship. *Haman and Mordecai* is printed in Händel's *Werke* (Leipzig, 1880), Lieferung XL; see also XLI.

[2] *Hist. MSS. Com.: Egmont MSS.* (diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards first Earl of Egmont), I (1920), 225. Newman Flower, in his *George Frideric Handel* (London, 1923), pp. 193–96, records these events, but errs in making the Egmont comment refer to a second performance.

ally without mention of Pope. His name appeared in at least two advertisements, however, one of which, in the *Daily Journal*, April 19, 1732, is as follows:

Never Perform'd in Publick before,

At the Great Room in Villars-street York-Buildings, To-morrow, being Thursday the 20th of this Instant April, will be perform'd, ESTHER an ORATORIO: or, SACRED DRAMA.

As it was compos'd originally for the most noble James Duke of Chandos, the Words by Mr. POPE, and the Musick by Mr. HANDEL.

Tickets to be had at the Place of Performance at 5s. each.

To begin exactly at 7 o'Clock.

Impressed very likely with the success of these beginnings, Handel, even before this first public performance, had begun to revise and enlarge his sacred drama with additions to the book by Samuel Humphreys [1] — in this period more than once Handel's librettist. It was planned to produce *Esther* at the opera in the Haymarket, with appropriate scenery and dramatic action; but, because of objections by the clergy, the theatrical aspect of the presentation was dropped, and oratorio, without dramatic action, as since known in England, came into existence. A portion of a further notice in the *Daily Journal*, April 19, 1732, may be quoted as dating the revisions and announcing Handel's submission to the objections of the clergy:

Formerly composed by Mr. HANDEL, and now revised by him, with several Additions, and to be performed by a great Number of the best Voices and Instruments.

N.B. There will be no Action on the Stage, but the House will be fitted up in a decent Manner, for the Audience. The Musick to be disposed after the Manner of the Coronation Service. . . .

This fairly important moment in English musical history concerns us only because of the striking conjunction of the personalities involved. At a moment when Pope desired to stress his lack of animosity

[1] The book was published on May 2, for the first Haymarket performance, given that evening. (See the advertisement in the *Daily Journal*, April 25, 1732.) The Earl of Egmont attended and recorded this first performance at the opera as well as the second (May 6). Other performances were given on May 9, 13, 16, and 20. The royal family attended the performances of May 2, 13, and 20.

to the Duke of Chandos, Bernard Gates, desirous of honoring the birthday of his master, Handel, revived a long-forgotten piece in which Handel and Pope (probably friends since the time when the Earl of Burlington became a patron to both) had collaborated for the pleasure of the Duke. The reasons why Gates chose *Haman and Mordecai* rather than (for example) the more promising Handel-Gay cantata, *Acis and Galatea*, would be interesting to know. It is quite possible that this revival, from which came the unexpected birth of a new musical form, owed something to a suggestion from Lord Burlington, from Dr. Arbuthnot, or from Pope himself. At any rate, a desired effect (so far as Pope was concerned) was produced: the Earl of Egmont and everyone else knew that the *History of Hester* had originally been "writ by Pope" for performance at Cannons. The poet's part in this one of "Mr. *Hendel*'s Noble *Oratories*" had proved serviceable.

From this episode, as from all the others in the known relations of Pope with the Duke of Chandos before 1731, it seems unlikely that Pope would wish to ridicule the Duke's person, his house, or the music of his chapel after the fashion of that of Timon's villa, where

> Light quirks of music, broken and uneven,
> Make the soul dance upon a jig to Heaven.[1]

But, on the other hand, if Pope *had* ridiculed Cannons, the satire would not have been an exhibition of villainous ingratitude.

III

Why, then, was he so perturbed by the commotion over Timon's villa? The answer, I believe, is to be found in the fact that several of Pope's friends — notably Dr. Arbuthnot — were intimate with the Duke, and they would inevitably be irritated by the awkward application of Pope's satire. It has been suggested that Pope's "building" friends, Bathurst and Burlington, would be pleased to see their rival,

[1] Well known are Pope's compliment to Handel in the *Dunciad* (1742/43), Book IV, lines 65–69, and Handel's friendly act of acknowledgment — the insertion in *Semele* (1743) of the beautiful setting of Pope's lines, "Where e'er you walk," etc.

It is possible that the "Light quirks of music" of Timon's villa might refer to anthems written by Buononcini for Blenheim, a palace which, for its Brobdingnagian aspects, had before 1731 received comments from Pope, much like some of those made on Timon's villa. (See Pope's *Works*, IV, 451, and X, 264–65.)

Chandos, attacked. But the Duke's letter books show that these men were his intimates. Cannons was evidently in the Palladian manner,[1] and so might have had Burlington's approval. Burlington's protégé, Kent, painted two or three ceilings of the house,[2] and for all that is now known much of the work may have been under the influence of the Chiswick, or Burlington, school. Such matters apart, it is worth noting that in 1728 Lord Henry Brydges, second son and eventual successor to the first Duke of Chandos, had married the step-daughter of Burlington's brother-in-law, Lord Bruce — a match which Burlington, as head of the family, doubtless approved. The families, furthermore, were so intimate that in June and July of 1730 (perhaps at the very time Pope was composing his *Epistle*) the Duke and Duchess of Chandos were at Tunbridge Wells with the Countess of Burlington — of whom Pope thought as highly as he did of her husband the Earl. The Chandos letter books (Volumes XXXV and XXXVI) show a close intimacy between the Duchess and the Countess of Burlington. If Pope had wanted to attack Cannons, that was perhaps permissible; but it would be inept, if not insane, to place such an attack in an epistle addressed to a close friend of the owner of Cannons.

Less important, but still significant, is the intimacy of Chandos with Bathurst and Bolingbroke. Both had befriended the Paymaster General in the days when the Tories wished to turn him out of office in disgrace. In 1727 the Duke wrote that "Lord Bathurst (at that time in y^e^ House of Commons) spoke very friendly in my behalf, and left his Party to Vote for me. After having told you this I hope you know me too well to think I can act against him[3] . . . " [i.e., in an election]. In 1735 Chandos thanked Bathurst for a "noble present" — apparently a horse;[4] and the continued cordiality of their relations seems indubitable. The case of Bolingbroke is much the same. The early relations of Henry St. John and James Brydges were close enough to be financially positively scandalous. St. John borrowed from Brydges; and as Secretary of State, during a war, gave the Paymaster General "tips" as to likely turns in the stock market. For example:

[1] Robinson, *The Princely Chandos*, pp. 62 ff.
[2] Letter Books, XVIII, 196 (November 4, 1720).
[3] *Ibid.*, XXX, 234.
[4] *Ibid.*, XLVI, 236.

31 May 1712

Dr Sr

I have just time to tell you that ye letters I have rec[eive]d to day give me reason to apprehend some dropping in ye stocks, thô I hope our great work will go on. Adieu burn this & let me see you as soon as you come to town.

H. St John. [1]

During Bolingbroke's exile Chandos offered him remittances, and, when Bolingbroke was too speedily returning from exile in 1723, wrote to him: "Your Lordship having no house in Town, you'l give me Leave to make a Tender to you of mine which you may freely command." [2] When difficulties arose over further actions necessary to regularize Bolingbroke's status upon his return, Chandos tactfully arranged a dinner at Cannons for Bolingbroke and Walpole.[3] It seems possible that later these two friends were less close; if so, the probable reason was that Chandos needed the moneys he had lent to Bolingbroke. There is no real evidence of declining friendliness except that fewer letters are preserved; one can hardly argue surely from mere silence.

Of all Pope's friends, however, the one most intimate with Chandos was doubtless Dr. Arbuthnot. The Duke's letter books contain copies of between forty and fifty letters to Dr. Arbuthnot or to members of his family, and there are many mentions of the Doctor in other letters. The friendship antedates 1712, and terminated only with the Doctor's death in 1735. None of the letters, perhaps, is of great interest. The Doctor is begged to come for a game of ombre Christmas night, 1730. He recommends a brother of Scarlatti for the Duke's music; he is more than once consulted on matters musical, religious, financial, and scientific — especially on various "projects" by which after 1720 His Grace hoped to recoup his fortunes. As early as 1718 Chandos asks Arbuthnot's counsel as to the regulation of the diet and wages of the staff at Cannons: "the Consumption of Flowr Bread Flesh Charcoal, & in short of every thing is much greater than it ought to be frº yᵉ Nº of heads in yᵉ Family wᶜʰ in mine amounts to 83 here at Cannons." [4]

[1] Letter Books containing letters to Chandos, XI, 250.
[2] Letter Books, XXII, 266.
[3] *Ibid.*, XXII, 285.
[4] *Ibid.*, XV, 231–32.

At Timon's villa the visitor heard (line 152)

A hundred footsteps scrape the marble hall;

and Aaron Hill had written Pope that "the hundred footsteps, the exact number of his domestics for some years at Canons," was one of the crucial details in identifying Chandos and Timon.[1] But, if the Duke found 83 an extravagant number in his palmy days before the South Sea Bubble, Hill probably erred in saying there were a hundred in 1731.

It is unfortunate and at first surprising that the Chandos letter books contain no copies of letters to Arbuthnot about Pope's *Epistle to Burlington*. One must assume that the two friends saw each other frequently in London and that their communications to each other on the subject were oral. It is important to know, however, that shortly before the *Epistle* appeared the Duke and Arbuthnot had been together at Bath. His Grace was there from the middle of September to the middle of December, and on October 24 he wrote, apparently for the Duchess and himself, to Arbuthnot (who had just returned to London?), regretting that the Doctor could not have remained longer with them.[2] Here again, then, we meet a highly improbable situation: Pope, so we are asked to imagine, was about to satirize the Duke of Chandos as Timon. He knew of the intimacy between the Duke and Arbuthnot, and one can hardly believe that he would bring out such a satire intentionally to wound one of the best friends of one of his own best friends, or that he would address the satire to Burlington, who also would resent an attack upon Chandos.

IV

What, then, shall we conclude? The best authorities have always been convinced that Timon meant Chandos. Dr. Johnson says, "By Timon he was universally supposed, and by the Earl of Burlington, . . . was privately said, to mean the Duke of Chandos."[3] One must retort

[1] Pope's *Works*, X, 44. The other two crucial details were the chapel music and Timon's decline in fortune.

[2] Letter Books, XXXVIII, 238.

[3] Johnson, *Lives*, III, 152.

in the Doctor's own words of another remark about Pope: "Depend upon it, sir, this is too strongly stated." It is unthinkable that Burlington would make such a remark privately, when he had been publicly quoted to the opposite effect. On January 20, 1731/2, when the third edition of Pope's poem was published, Pope prefixed to it a letter addressed to Burlington, which has not been reprinted so often as it should have been. The first half of it is as follows:

My Lord,

The Clamour rais'd about this Epistle could not give me so much pain, as I receiv'd pleasure in seeing the general Zeal of the World in the cause of a Great Man who is Beneficent, and the particular Warmth of your Lordship in that of a private Man who is innocent.

It was not the *Poem* that deserv'd this from you; for as I had the Honour to be your Friend, I cou'd not treat you quite like a Poet: but sure the *Writer* deserv'd more Candor even from those who knew him not, than to promote a Report which in regard to that Noble Person, was *Impertinent*; in regard to me, *Villainous*. Yet I had no great Cause to wonder, that a Character belonging to *twenty* shou'd be applied to *one*; since by that means, *nineteen* wou'd escape the Ridicule.

I was too well content with my Knowledge of that noble Person's Opinion in this Affair, to trouble the publick about it. But since Malice and Mistake are so long a dying, I take the opportunity of this third Edition to declare *His Belief*, not only of *My Innocence*, but of *Their Malignity*, of the former of which my own Heart is as conscious, as I fear some of theirs must be of the latter. His Humanity feels a Concern for the Injury done to *Me*, while His Greatness of Mind can bear with Indifference the Insult offered to *Himself*.

This letter has been called shuffling and equivocal, but quite obviously it is nothing of the sort. It is, to be sure, written with the elaborate suavity that befitted eighteenth-century authors when addressing noble lords in print; but it makes clear several points, among which are:

1. That Burlington had shown particular warmth in asserting Pope's innocence.

2. That Pope regarded the identification of Timon and Chandos as villainous and malignant.

3. That the Duke (as we can now see from his letter, which Pope

here paraphrases) had declared his belief in Pope's innocence and in the malignity of the town towards himself.

4. That, in all probability, both Burlington and Chandos authorized, or at least permitted, Pope to state their positions in the matter.

In view of the documents already cited here, Pope's statements in this letter prefatory to the third edition of his *Epistle* are all plausible. He could hardly go further without additional embarrassment. When he denied that Chandos had ever made him presents, his foes veered about and cried, . . . " 'tis very plain that Mr. *Pope*'s *Pique* to the *Duke* was not because he *had* given him *Money*, but because he had *not*." [1] One could not answer the wind. If Pope had contented himself with the blunt assertion that he had not intended Cannons, his enemies would have had no interest in such a "partisan" account of his intentions. They judged by the "light quirks of music," the "hundred footsteps," and the prophecy of Ceres' return to the terraced slopes (lines 173–76). Some details, no one could deny, might very well apply to Cannons; but, in view of the small kindnesses that had passed between Pope and the Duke, and the very close friendships that Burlington and Dr. Arbuthnot sustained with Chandos, it does not seem probable that Pope intended any details to be so applied.

The satire, then, was awkward. That was what irritated both Pope and his friends. Hogarth caught the idea when his print (almost immediately suppressed) represented Pope with the whitewash of taste bespattering those who by accident happened to pass. Aaron Hill stated the matter bluntly in words:

> That unguarded absence of caution, which is a mark by which one may be sure a purpose was either angry or generous, has prevented you from examining your piece before it was published with the sharpness of an eye that is watchful of occasion to slander, or you would have foreseen, that the unlucky name of Timon would be applied, as it has since been, . . .[2]

Irritation at Pope's carelessness, one suspects, would affect Dr. Arbuthnot most among Pope's acquaintance. In the summer of 1734, during Arbuthnot's last illness, he wrote Pope a letter that evidently touched upon the necessity of more care in the use of personal satire.

[1] *The Poet finish'd in Prose* (1735), p. 58.
[2] *Works*, X, 44.

Pope's reply, the holograph of which is now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, runs in part as follows:

I thank you, dear sir, for making that your request to me, which I make my pride, nay my duty; — "that I should continue my disdain and abhorrence of vice, and manifest it still in my writings." I would indeed do it with more restrictions, and less personally; it is more agreeable to my nature, which those who know it not are greatly mistaken in. But general satire in times of general vice has no force and is no punishment: people have ceased to be ashamed of it when so many are joined with them; and it is only by hunting one or two from the herd that any examples can be made. If a man writ all his life against the collective body of the banditti, or against lawyers, would it do the least good, or lessen the body? But if some are hung up, or pilloried, it may prevent others. And in my low station, with no other power than this, I hope to deter, if not to reform.[1]

This states the dilemma of satire as Pope saw it: if general, it is ineffective; if personal, it seems cruel. These ideas grew into the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*; it is, let us hope, not too fanciful to imagine that they grew out of Dr. Arbuthnot's annoyance at the applications made by hostile persons of more than one of Pope's "characters" — chief of which would be Timon.

In regard to Pope's personal relationships, the *Epistle to Burlington* was unfortunate; but no one would wish to leave an impression that (personalities apart) the poem itself is to be set down as awkward. Since Horace Walpole's day, Pope's influence in the reform of gardening has been generously recognized, and in this reform the *Epistle to Burlington* was his chief written instrument. As a part of his contribution to the cultural development of his century, it is surpassed in importance only by the *Essay on Man*, the *Essay on Criticism*, and possibly the *Dunciad*. One should in general read it not for its personalities but for the sound esthetic principles that it enunciates in its incisive and finished verses in favor of Palladian dignity and simplicity.

[1] *Ibid.*, VII, 480.

NOTES

LETTERS OF HENRY ST. JOHN TO JAMES BRYDGES

THESE letters from Henry St. John (created Viscount Bolingbroke, July 7, 1712) to James Brydges (created Duke of Chandos, April 29, 1719) have been transcribed from the latter's letter books, now in the Huntington Library (Stowe MS 58). Although the St. John letters are only copies (the originals having disappeared), the capitalization, contractions (with certain exceptions), punctuation, and spelling have been preserved.

St. John was Secretary at War during 1704–8, was turned out of office after the ministry became wholly Whig in 1708, and was appointed Secretary of State, in 1710, in the new Tory administration. Brydges remained Paymaster General of the Forces Abroad during the period covered by these letters. Some of Brydges' replies to St. John have been preserved in the "out" letter books (42 letters; Stowe MS 57), and the copyist noted, under the date of St. John's letter, the existence of an answer. Inasmuch as there are other letters from Brydges to St. John, these replies have not been printed here, because it is hoped to publish the whole series in some future number of the *Bulletin*.

Although not of the first importance, St. John's correspondence with Brydges is significant, because, for Queen Anne's reign, there are so few of his private letters in existence, because these specimens are to a friend and kinsman and are consequently frank and direct, because they contain comments on public events when little else is known of their writer's views, and because they reveal the financial relations between the two men, who seem to have tried to use their official positions to perpetrate a job.

GODFREY DAVIES
MARION TINLING

Bucklebury Oct^{br} the 1. 1706

Dear Kinsman

I Came hither Yesterday before two a Clock and hope by the same hour on Thursday to be so happy as to Injoy your Company then. Which nothing Can be more agreeable to one who really Esteems you and heartily loves you: My Coach will be ready to attend you att y^{e} Greyhound in Maidenhead by nine a Clock and if you sett out from thence before ten you will arrive as Early as I Did The Weather is Perfectly fine and I hope you will Be pleased with this Expedition
I am Dear S^{r}

Yo^{r} Most Affectionnate
Kinsman and Most Obedient
Servant
H S^{t} John:

I beg of you to order a servant to goe to the Jesamine tree in Pell mell Over against the Queen armes and buy for me ½ a pound of the same snuff as Maj^{r} Feilding [1] takes. The man by this destintion will know what sort to Give

Bucklebury Octo^{br} the 3. 1706

Dear Kinsman

I am Exstreemly sorrey you Cannot spare time to make me happy in Yo^{r} good Company. And I will flatter my self so far as to beleive that if you Could have Dispens'd with the Duty of Yo^{r} Office yo^{r} inclination would have brought you hither I find by letters of the seventh from the Camp that incessint rains have Obliged my Lord Duke [2] to lay a side his Design of Besieging Mons: So that probably he will be here in the begining of Novem^{r} Where I must be of Opinion his spirit is very much wanted I hope to be in towne before the 20th and sooner: my privat affairs will suffer if I return Where ever I am I shall steadily approve my self Dear S^{r}

Yo^{r} Most faithfull
friend and Humble Servant
H S^{t} John:

[1] Probably Robert Feilding, the celebrated beau.
[2] Marlborough, commander in chief of the allied armies in the Netherlands.

Margate March the 24th $170\frac{6}{7}$

Dear Kinsman

The wind is directly Contrary and blows extreamly hard so that our stay here is very uncertain

My Lord Duke has told me that my Affair was settled in the same manner as You gave me an Acco[t] of the day before I left London. You have in this and so many other instances shewn your kindness to me, that if my thanks were to keep apace with your good offices, I shou'd become troublesome in expressing myself gratefull.

I shall improve here as much as I can the Impression that it is the universal inclination to have as much English Manufacture as possible sent abroad for the Service of the Queen's Troops and of Her Allys, and I am of opinion that what has pass'd on this Head will further any new proposal extreamly, in the mean time I suppose the present undertaking goes on. I not being in Town to take Care of Tonnage for it, it wou'd be proper for M[r] Churchill [1] to apply to M[r] Secretary Harley [2] in time, since the early going of these Cloaths is one great argument for sending them.

I am
Dear S[r]
&c
H: S[t] John

D[r] James

I was to have attended my L[d] Treare [3] yesterday morning but by the Fault of my Serv[ts] I did not receive notice in time thô. I was all Tuesday at my office.

I am just going to Bucklebury, and Shall be back on Sunday pray make my Excuses to L[d] Trearer.

&c.
H S[t] John.

May 29th 1707

[1] George Churchill, a younger brother of the Duke of Marlborough.
[2] Robert Harley, Secretary of State, 1704–8.
[3] Sidney, Lord Godolphin, Lord Treasurer.

Whitehall June 13 1707

Dear Kinsman

The Business of my office allowing my Absence for a Few days, I intend to Morrow morning to go to Bucklebury, where I Beleive I Shall putt an End to the Affair w^{ch} I have been so long Transacting wth Dollman,[1] and w^{ch} is of no Small Consequence.

If my Lord Trear. should allow you to pay the Money upon the Warr^{t} w^{ch} he was so very kind as to approve of, I Desire You to putt it into M^{r} Lynn's [2] hands and it will save me the Expence of Raysing that Sume another way. I am so afraid of being importunate that I have not Sollicited my Lord in this Matter; perhaps he may remember it, if You take an opp^{ty} of Saying a word abo^{t} it. I shall be back at Furthest on Wednesday

Beleive me ever
&c
H: S^{t} John

Bucklebury Sep^{t} 20th 1707

Dear Kinsman

Not being able to find att Windsor whether my Lord Trear. will set at the Cockpitt on Tuesday, and the Queen's Coming on Wensday to Kensington making it Probable he will not, I came on, after waiting on the Queen, to this Place, where I would willingly Continue ten days or a Fortnight, having not only little reparacoñs to attend, but Acco^{ts} to state, Courts to hold and such like Country business to dispatch.

However upon any Intimacoñ that You think it requisite I should be in Town, M^{r} Lynne will send an Express to me, and I will Certainly wait on You the next morn. I dont mean only to be sent for in Case Publick business should call me, but hope if I Can be of the least Service to You on the Occasion of Yo^{r} Father's illness, w^{ch} may per-

[1] He bought Doleman's estate. (*Historical Manuscripts Commission, Portland Manuscripts*, V [1899], 379.)

[2] Probably Muster Master General Samuel Lynn, whose official position brought him into contact with St. John.

haps oblige You to go into Herefordshire, that You will let me have imediate notice.

I have nothing more at heart than a sence of the Obligacoñs I have to You, and if my life or Fortune could be of use to You, they should be Frankly Ventur'd in Yo^r^ Service. &c.

H S^t^ John

Monday Morning 10 a Clock 22 Sep^r^ 1707
Answ^d^ 24^th^ Sep^r^

Dear Sir

I receive this minute Y^r^ Express, and send him back w^th^ the report sign'd w^ch^ I think very fully, & Yet very Cautiously drawne; I Could only wish we had insisted a little more on the advantage of having these Manufactures Consum'd, by the Forreign Troops, and the Easiness of having that Acco^t^ kept.

The Palatines [1] are now going into Spaine, the Elector agrees we should Pay them on the Spott accord^g^ to their Effective Numbers, how Easy will it be in this Instance to Acco^t^ w^th^ 'em̄ for all Accoutrem^ts^ w^ch^ they shall receive. My Lord Trear. will not I Beleive sitt till Wensday, & if it be absolutely necessary I should be in Town, I suppose I shall hear from You, or by Yo^r^ Ord^r^ from M^r^ Lynn, who will take care to lay a Sett of Horses on the road for me.

I hope you have recd my L^re^

&c
H S^t^ John

Bucklebury Sep^r^ 28^th^ 1707

Dearest Kinsman

I receiv'd Yo^rs^ by Express this Morning, and herew^th^ returne the Contract to You Sign'd, but think it behooves us to take Care when we report this Matter specially to my Lord Trear. to have his Approbacoñ thereof in Authentique Mann^r^ otherwise we shall appear to have Acted w^thout a good Vouch^r^ Those w^th^ whom we deal are

[1] I. e., mercenary German troops.

not to have their Names in Question, and are of a Character to place their Point of honr in Gaine only, but You & I must take Care to walk more warily. I am of Yor Opinion in the Judgmt You make of Moor,[1] and therefore if he Can agree wth Cornish would have the Foot Accoutremts Contracted for, but this is entirely in his Power to turn as he thinks good, since neither You nor I can appear & act.

Pray in the Report let it be layd as fair as Possible for a direct Approbacoñ. I Find Churchill & Harnage[2] venture to attempt to Force us to agree wth them, and I do not know how farr they may go in Whispering, & giving hints in Ordr to take revenge.

I can not yet tell Precisely the day I shall returne to London, but in a Post or two will inform You of it.

I send You a Lre wch when I was in Towne I forgott to Shew You from Cardonnel,[3] because it relates to the Palatines undr Yor Care. I have writt to him for the new Treaty. &c.

H St John

when you have ready the Lre of Mr Cardonnel pray give it to Fury of my office to Lay by.

I send you the Enclos'd note from Mr Lynne to shew you that Churchill & Harnage talk

London Mar: 30th 1708

Dear Sir

I was surpriz'd to hear of Yor Journey into Herefdshire and very Sorry for the Occasion of it. The Trouble You are to Expect and the Expence wch must be the Consequence of Such a Contest[4] are both disagreable; but in my humble Opinion not to be Chose for the Same Place again would be more so, all Circumstances consider'd.

I can hardly flatter my Self so far as to think I may be of any use

[1] Probably Arthur Moore.

[2] Probably Richard Harnage, M.P.

[3] Adam Cardonnel, secretary to Marlborough. For his correspondence with Brydges, see *Huntington Library Bulletin*, No. 2, pp. 138–42.

[4] Referring to the general election when Brydges was returned as one of the members for Hereford, in May, 1708.

to You here during Yo^{r} Absence, if I Could be so no man living would Serve you wth more Sincerity of heart.

I hope Soon to hear of Yo^{r} Subduing the difficulties w^{ch} are now in Yo^{r} way, and of Y^{r} return to Lond^{o} Y^{r} Success in Every thing is the hearty wish of

&c.
H S^{t} John

Bucklebury July 29th 1708

D^{r} S^{r}

I Returne You a thousand times thanks for Yo^{r} obliging L^{re} and for the Promise w^{ch} you are so kind as to make me of Coming to this Place before the Summ^{r} Season is quite Expired. No Man Loves You better, or can taste more Satisfaction in Yo^{r} Conversation, and could I Enjoy you & a very few more friends as frequently at this Place as it is Easy [to] do in Lond^{o}, I w^{d} not only make people beleive I intended to Spend the rem^{r} of my days here but I would steadily resolve to do so.

I take the Liberty of Enclosing to You an Answ^{r} to the L^{re} w^{ch} I received from M. Gen^{l} Cadogan;[1] he hopes that Lisle & Tournay will be both taken this Year; these Conquests will open so wide a gap in the Fr: Frontier, that I Can hardly doubt, but that the Enemy will give us this Winter those terms, w^{ch} According to the Natural Course of things we may Expect to extorte from 'em in another Campagne.

A Fallacious Peace can never be safe, a safe one can never be more necessary.

I hardly ever can see you or write to You but I have some fresh Occasion of thanking You for some fav^{r} or other. Yo^{r} kindness to Breton[2] is a great Addition to those many Obligacoñs by w^{ch} I am fix'd to be as long as I live

&c
H S^{t} John.

[1] William Cadogan, Quartermaster General to Marlborough. For his correspondence with Brydges, see *ibid.*, pp. 142–43.

[2] William Breton, envoy extraordinary at Berlin, 1712–14.

Bucklebury Jan: 6th 170$\frac{8}{9}$

Deare Sr

Tho every Post about a man is almost numb'd wth frost yet I hope to be able to thaw my fingers soe much as to scrall out a few lines to you. Sr Symon Harcourt [1] is now in London, my Lady Frances Winchcombes [2] settlement are in his Custody, he will let you know what powers over the Houses in Golden Square [3] are left to my Wife & me, and as far as we can goe you may be assured we will in such manner as you shall desire.

I have nothing more to add but to desire you to let Harcourt have a Counterpart of the Mortgage & to assure you of an inviolable friendshipp. Deare Kinsman &c

H St John

Bucklebury June ye 5th 1709
Answd June 11th 1709

Dr Sr

I take the Liberty for greater safety to trouble you wth ye Inclosed, and the rather because it affords me an Opportunity of renewing those Assureances of an inviolable freindshipp, wch I must ever retaine in my heart for you, since my stars, or perhaps my opinions, have thrown me thus much out of the way, it is a very great sattisfaction to me to think that Justice is done to the meritt of those whome I love as well as my selfe ye pleasing prospect of peace is a gaine remov'd farther off, for mypart I cannot help beleiving that the Sword will bring that about wch the Pen Could not, and let my Ld Gallway [4] loose battles as fast as he pleases in Spaine My Ld Marlborough will scourge his Countrymen into absolute submission in Piccardy before the Campaine is over. You will doe me Greate Justice in beleiving me Dr Sr &c

H St John

[1] Created Baron Harcourt, 1711, and appointed Lord Chancellor, 1713.

[2] Frances (Howard), widow of Sir Henry Winchcombe and daughter of Thomas, 3d Earl of Berkshire; died December 22, 1707.

[3] See Henry B. Wheatley, *London Past and Present*, II (London, 1891), 121–22.

[4] Henri de Massue de Ruvigny, Earl of Galway (originally a Huguenot refugee), who commanded the allied forces in Spain and was defeated at the battle of Almanza, in 1707.

Bucklebury June 26th 1709
Answd July the 8th 1709

Dr Sr

If I did not Answr yr obligeing letter by the next post After my receipt of it you may be assured that I did not want Inclination to repeate the Pleasure of Corresponding wth you as often As possible, but that I fear'd sattisfyeing myselfe at yr Expence. You have soe little to doe that I ought to make Conscience of mispending Your Time. I am to thank you for takeing Care to forwd my Letter to Lt Genl Cadogan. I am not Vaine Enough to Imagine that my Letter Can be very Entertaineing to him; but a friendspp of some standing, and no small Intimacy, cannot with me easily dwindle into a bare remembrance; Peace is at this time the most desireable publick or private Good if you will not think yt I putt on to much of the Country Esqr Ile Venture to tell you, that wee want it more then perhaps any man out of the Country can Imagine. Glorious Successes and the hopes of a last Campaine are Soveraigne Cordials They Elevate the few spirits we have left and wee are not seen to pine or Languish; but should the Distemper Continue the strings of Life may Crack at once, upon my faith Kinsman, Misse's Edwards Shillings, the Dame's five pound peices & the Old Gentlemans Carolus's Compose the Greatest part of the Little Coine, wch wee Tillers of the Land, are soe happy as to handle [1]

I should not be soe merry upon soe grave a Subject had I not a faith, wch Comes neare toe Superstition, in my Ld Duke

I doe verely beleive he is borne to fix ye Liberty of Europe, and to procure us a safe and lasting Peace. When this is once done our Wrangles att home are of no Consequence. Who ever has the pow'r the Whole will be safe.

My letter is growne insensibly longer than I design'd it wch I hope you'l forgive. When the heart goes with the pen its hard to leave leave off. Sure I am it does soe when I subscribe my

Selfe Dr Sr
&c
St John

[1] The point seems to be that money had become so scarce that the only coins in circulation in the countryside were old pieces that had been hoarded, such as the shilling of Edward VI, the five-pound gold piece of Charles II, and the twenty-shilling gold piece of Charles I.

Bucklebury July 26th 1709
Answd Augt 14: 1709

Dr Sr

A Journey I lately took to a hunting Seate in Wiltshiere [1] wch my Ld Abingdon [2] has beene soe kind as to lend me, as well as the Apprhension of giveing you to frequent troubles, has kept me some posts from sending you any of my Letters; I Congratulate now wth you upon the takeing of Tournay wch was I suppose more sudden than naturally could have been Expected.

God onely know's what is Expected in this restless unsattisfyed Country of our's but I heare it already every were said, that if this Campaigne is spent in Seiges, it will onely serve to lay the foundation of another.

Pray God that opinion wch you mention may prove true Peace is the greatest blessing wch at this time, especially man Can Ask, or favour Grant.

I have heard from other hands as well as by yr Letter of the Vice Chamberlains [3] Mariage. His Conduct Joyn'd to the knowledge I had of he Character, made me expt it. I wish him happy in every Circumstance of life, but I can have no very good notion of a match made by the Pintle and wherein the head has noe share.

I goe the day after to morrow to Astrop for a Month. If you doe me the favour to write to me, a Letter directed hither by brackley bagg Northamptonshire will Certainely Come to my hands. I am &c

H St John

Astrop Augt ye 20th 1709
Answd Sept: 9th 1709

Deare Sr

I am infinitely obliged to you for the Acct wch you took the trouble to write me of our prsent Scituations and for the Journalls wch you sent me Enclosed. ye Cappit: of Monsr de Surville [4] seem's to have

[1] See letter of October 6, 1709.
[2] Montague Venables-Bertie, 2d Earl of Abingdon.
[3] Thomas Coke married Mary, daughter of William Hale, about October, 1709.
[4] See Marlborough's letter of August 5, for de Surville's proposal to send to Paris to ob-

beene proposed onely to gaine time and refresh the Garrison I doubt wee have beene twice this yeare Dupes to the Same Article all the difficultyes w^{ch} obstruct a peace now france is soe much reduced & better term's then ever wee had reason to expect are to be obtain'd make one naturall reflect on the ill Consequence of drawing plan's for negotiations in an Assembly of five hundred. I wish with all my heart that the late Advantage gain'd over the french in Savoy to put himelfe att the head of the Armey & to push the Warr on the Rhine in Spaine there will be a Cessation I suppose of Arm's of Course. I Cannot help Wishing there may be one on the side of Portugall when I consider who Comm^{ds} there You are not D^{r} S^{r} to Ask pardon for putting me in mind of the money w^{ch} I owe you, on the Contrary it becomes me very much to Ask y^{rs} As I doe very heartily for keeping you soe long out of it the breaking off y^{e} peace broke off [1] a bargaine I was in for y^{e} Sale of my Esseex Estate, wth w^{ch} I proposed to have Cleared wth you and finish all the little purchases I make in Barkshiere. However I have more than 3000 due to me, And if I can possibly gett it in M^{r} Lund[2] shall Imediately pay it to y^{r} Ord^{r} I goe home the begining of next week, where I expect to meet the person from whome y^{e} money is due, and likewise M^{r} Collier thro' whose hands my buisness goes, you shall here from me assoone as I have seene them. my Obligations to you are such that rather than you should suffer the least Inconveniency I would borrow, pawne, Mortgage, beg and doe any thing but steale. doe me the Justice to beleive this of S^{r} &c

H S^{t} John

Bucklebury Sept: 8th 1709
Answ^{d} Sept: 10 1709 S. V

D^{r} S^{r}

You shoud have heard much sooner from me, according to what I have promissed in the last letter w^{ch} I writt to you from Astrop had I

tain permission to surrender the citadel of Tournai if it were not relieved by September 5. (William Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough* [London, 1809], III, 58.)

[1] See G. M. Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*, II (London, 1932), 399–400.

[2] John Lund, who acted as St. John's financial agent.

not been disappointed myselfe Mr Collier came hither but 2 day's agoe and the person I mention'd is not yet arriv'd.

Assoone as I can gett in my money I will in the first place Returne that wch you sent me in a manner never to be forgott, nor ever to be sufficiently acknowledged, but if your affaires should require part of it sooner, I have no fortune noe Creditt wch shall not be strain'd to the uttmost for yr Service

Mr Collier will be in London in a Moneths time & his first buisness shall be to waite on you. And now Dr Kinsman let me Congratulate wth you upon the great success [1] of my Ld Duke the french seem in this last Action to have Collected all there Spirit and to have made there last effort in the last Convulsion in ye pangs of Death ye strongest. yet they are beate. the same Genious has defeated there pride has overcome there despaire. I send a Letter to Mr Cadogan wth another Enclosed for my Ld D. & beg ye favr of you to forwd them to the Army. Surely now wee may hope that peace is not far off. it is onely this Consequence of Warr wch gives a true lustre to the greatest Glory in Arm's. I will detaine you know longer from being much better Employed but Subscribe my Self Dr Sr &c

St John

Bucklebury Sept. ye 15th 1709.
Answd Oct. 4: 1709.

Dear Sr

Yr letter of ye 10th came but last night to my hands. I cannot sufficiently express ye obligation I have to you, nor my gratefull sense of them. As soon as possibly I can, wch will be I hope in a very short time you may depend on receiving ye money due on ye note, as well as on ye other security.

I thank you extreamly for ye paper wch you have been so kind as to send me. The reason why we have no more particulars of ye late Battle, is, I imagine because they would only serve to shew how dear our victory cost us. Let any man give his fancy a loose, & he will be hardly able to form an idea of any thing so strong from nature & from

[1] The battle of Malplaquet.

art as y^e^ situation of y^e^ French camp. After being beat from w^ch^ it is not creadible that they will maintain any other ground, much less attack My L^d^ Duke but such rumors serve to keep up their people's hearts, & few are sagacious enough to observe that our loss was owing to their superiority in number & to y^e^ inaccessibility of their camp, not to a greater vigour shewn by them in this than in former actions.

I take y^e^ liberty to trouble you with y^e^ enclosed, w^ch^ I desire you to send by y^e^ next pacquet & am &c.

H. S^t^ John.

Bucklebury Oct. 6. 1709.
Answ^d^ Oct. 13

Dear S^r^

I hope this will find you perfectly free from y^e^ pain w^ch^ afflicted you when you writ last to me, & from all other uneasiness of body & of mind.

I was very much concern'd to hear of M^r^ Cadogan's wound, & surpris'd at y^e^ occasion on w^ch^ he recd it; since I imagined his employments & business very remote from that sort of service. I wish him heartily well. Poor Foxon [1] has, besides his gallantry, so much honesty & gratitude that I must think his death a loss, if it happens.

I go from this place to Lavington, a House which My L^d^ Abingdon lends me on y^e^ Wiltshire Downs, on Wesnesday next. I shall continue there amused with sports when y^e^ weather is good & with books when it is bad, y^e^ greatest part of this winter.

I[n] that retreat I desire you some times to remember as faithfull a friend, a[f]ectionate a kinsman, & humble a servant as ever man had, in

H S^t^ John

I gave you some time ago y^e^ trouble of a letter for M^r^ Cadogan, with one enclosed for L^d^ Marlborough. I should be glad to know, whether you think they came safe to hand.

[1] Thomas Foxon, appointed Lieutenant Colonel *en second* in Colonel William Breton's regiment of foot, May 6, 1709. (Charles Dalton, *English Army Lists*, VI [London, 1904], 167.)

Lavington 18. Nov. 1709.

Dear S^r^

I receive this moment by a servant who is come from Backlebury y^r^ letter of y^e^ 11^th^ of this month, but y^e^ other must have miscarry'd by y^e^ direction.

I am extreamly glad to hear My L^d^ Duke's safe arrival, & of y^e^ good health in w^ch^ he returns, of this & of my humble respect & service, you will do me great justice in assuring him.

The particulars you are pleas'd to mention flatter one with y^e^ prospect of Peace, & yet I received a letter, in w^ch^ I was told of 12 new Regiments to be rais'd, besides one of Dragoons, w^ch^ L^d^ Wharton[1] is to command, & this circumstance seem'd to savour more of warr than peace.

I am not yet certain whether I shall come to London before Christmass or after that time. my business there is to conclude an agreement with my father, w^ch^ has been a good while depending, & on y^e^ doing of w^ch^ I shall clear & settle my little fortune. For y^e^ improvement of this I am to nobody so much oblig'd as to you & I will eternally acknowledge it with y^e^ utmost gratitude.
Dear S^r^ I am with true respect &c.

H. S^t^ John.

You hear I believe that I am not forgot, even thus far out of y^e^ way. Some good friends of mine have thought fit to place me on y^e^ List of Sheriffs.

July y^e^ 7^th^ 1710.

Dear Kinsman

I got from Post, Tobacco, ale, & Freeholders[2] last night, & y^e^ first news I heard was y^t^ my friend Breton is under persecution. I have since spoke to him, & he tells me y^t^ he is partly in y^r^ hands. If he

[1] Thomas, Earl of Wharton, did receive a commission to raise a regiment of dragoons. (See *ibid.*, p. 229.)

[2] Possibly a copyist's error, inasmuch as there is no newspaper of this main title known for 1710.

was wholly so, I sh^{d} think him safe, but since that is not y^{e} case, I must entreat you to make y^{e} best struggle you possibly can for him

The justice of his cause & his own merit are sufficient pleas in his behalf, to one who is so great a friend of y^{e} first & so good a judg of y^{e} latter. But you will give me leave to add that I hope it will be some advantage to him that his interest is always mine, & whatever is a favor to him, is y^{e} greatest obligation that can be lay'd upon D^{r} S^{r}

H. S^{t} John.

Lord Coningsby is this day turned out, & his employment give to L^{d} Anglesey.[1]

July y^{e} 8th 1710.

Dear S^{r}

When y^{r} servant was here, I was in Company & c^{d} not possibly write, but I send this to y^{r} office, & hope it will come safe & in time to y^{r} hands. We are in an age & country where every thing fluctuates to such a degree that its prety hard to fix in ones thoughts w^{t} will certainly happen. For my own part I have taken my measures, as if that w^{ch} you mention was inevitable.[2] in all cases this seems to be y^{e} safest rule.

If there is any thing for y^{r} service command me, as one who is faithfully y^{r} friend, & who as far as his poor power reaches will approve himself such. Should I have any usefull notice to give you, what may be y^{e} safest conveyance of a letter to you from D^{r} S^{r} &c.

H. S^{t} John.

London Aug y^{e} 1st 1710.

Dear S^{r}

Your letter of y^{e} 21st of y^{e} last month found me but y^{e} day before I left Berkshire, so that this is y^{e} first opportunity w^{ch} I have of returning you my thanks for it.

[1] Thomas, Lord Coningsby, was superseded, as Vice-Treasurer for Ireland, by Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, in the summer of 1710.

[2] Probably a general election.

You have certainly done extreamly right in acting as if a dissolution was inevitable & I am very glad to hear that y^r^ Success makes you so good amends for that disagreable kind of labour w^ch^ you must have gone thrô.

I do not yet hear of any opposition att all w^ch^ I am likely to meet with at Wootton Basset,[1] & if any should be form'd, it can do me little hurt, & give me little trouble. The treaty you mention I was not let into y^e^ secret of. I can only say that it seems to me very difficult, if not utterly impossible to carry on with success a negociation of that kind between partys, amongst whom there is not y^e^ least confidence remaining.

A friend of mine is likely to suffer extreamly by y^e^ absence of so just a judge, as I am sure he would have been heard before, had you been in Town. The person I mean is Brigad^r^ Breton, concerning whom I took y^e^ liberty to trouble you with a letter.

I have nothing more to add but my hearty wishes for your prosperity & my sincere profession of being D^r^ S^r^ &c.

H. S^t^ John.

Whitehall 26. Jan. $171\frac{0}{1}$

D^r^ S^r^

I have twice or thrice forgot to put you in mind of Brig^r^ Breton's affair. He lyes with respect to his off-reckonings under a very great hardship, such a hardship as no one else in y^e^ same case has been reduc'd to, & w^ch^ I think my self y^e^ more oblig'd to endeavor to relieve him from, because I am fully persuaded being my friend was y^e^ chief, perhaps y^e^ only, reason for imposing it upon him. You will therefore do an act of great friendship both to him & to me in attempting to remove this grievance from one whose interest I look upon with y^e^ same eye as I look upon that of D^r^ S^r^ &c.

H. S^t^ John.

[1] St. John was returned for Wootton Bassett, and Brydges for Hereford, in October, 1710.

June 22nd 1711

Dear Sr

As busy as I am of a post night I cannot omit writing to you upon a subject wherein I think my self particularly concern'd. Mr Blake[1] made a very considerable provision of several sorts of stores for ye expedition commanded by Brigadier Hill.[2] As those preparations both for land & sea were kept private & went almost singly thro' my hands, so it fell to my share to contract on this occasion by ye Queen's command. The poor man is I believe half broke & discredited by being kept so long out of his money, after having extended his credit to ye utmost stretch. My Ld Treasurer [3] has promis'd me to give dispatch to this affair, & I am confident will do it, even to morrow morning, if you are so kind as to demand ye money. Mr Blake is in danger of being arrested. I am sure I had rather be so, than be teas'd at ye rate I have been about this matter. I beg yr assistance herein, & shall take it for as great a favor as if I was personally concern'd in it. I am ever Dr Sr &c.

H. St John.

Whitehall 23 Aug 1711

Dr Sr

It is in yr fate never to be free from my importunity. The inclos'd reference comes to you at my desire upon a case wch affects my friend Breton to a high degree. I know you will be just, & I flatter my self you will be favorable in yr report. If you could offer it when Benson [4] is not by to ye Treasurer, it might perhaps do better, he being extreamly partial to Wyvil.[5] I am for ever Dr kinsman yrs

H. St John.

[1] Theophilus Blyke, some of whose correspondence is preserved in the letter books.

[2] John Hill commanded the expedition the Tories sent against the French possessions in Canada in 1711.

[3] Robert Harley, Chancellor of the Exchequer (August, 1710) and Lord Treasurer (May, 1711).

[4] Robert Benson, Commissioner of the Treasury, 1710–11, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1711–13.

[5] Possibly Francis Wyvill, Captain of the "Cumberland."

19. Oct 1711

I think all will do well. Let me see you on Monday at my return. For God sake remember Will Breton's case, w^ch^ I got referr'd to you by y^e^ Treasury. It is more my concern than any thing can be, w^ch^ relates to my self. Adieu D^r^ S^r^ ever y^r^ slave

H: S^t^ John.

8 Jan. 171½

Dear Cosin

I was so pester'd with business & besieged with Company when y^r^ letter of y^e^ 6^th^ came to my hands that I c^d^ not then answer it.

I hope you will be in town to morrow night or Thursday, for before I see y^e^ Duke I sh^d^ be glad to speak with you. Till then Adieu I am sincerely affectionately & Heartily y^r^ friend & serv^t^

H. S^t^ John.

31 May 1712

D^r^ S^r^

I have just time to tell you that y^e^ letters I have recd to day give me reason to apprehend some dropping in y^e^ stocks, thô I hope our great work will go on.[1] Adieu burn this & let me see you as soon as you come to town.

H. S^t^ John.

[1] The preliminaries of peace.

A Project for a California Slave Colony in 1851

While preparing a survey of the material relative to California in the Huntington Library, the writer was impressed with the significance of the following letter in the Leidesdorff papers, written by James Gadsden to General Thomas Jefferson Green. It is dated December 7, 1851, more than a year after California had been admitted as a free state; hence the plan proposed — to secure a grant of land on which to develop a slave colony for the production of rice, cotton, and sugar — is of special importance both to students of the history of California and to students of slavery expansion.

James Gadsden is known most widely for his negotiation of the Gadsden Purchase in 1853. A native of Charleston, South Carolina, he was a lieutenant of engineers in the War of 1812, served under Andrew Jackson in the war against the Seminoles, and later spent many years in Florida, as commissioner to effect the removal of the Seminoles, as a member of the first legislature of the territory, and as a planter. In 1839 he returned to South Carolina, became active in railroad development, and was president of the South Carolina Railroad Company until 1850. He turned his attention particularly toward the project of a transcontinental railroad along a southern route. His interest in the Gila River valley as an approach to California is reflected in the letter and in his efforts two years later when as minister to Mexico he negotiated for the acquisition of the land south of the river.

The addressee of the letter, General Thomas Jefferson Green, was a most picturesque individual. Born in North Carolina and educated at West Point, he was in the North Carolina legislature in 1826; then he migrated to Florida Territory and served in its legislature. Perhaps it was there that he formed his acquaintance with Gadsden. He removed to Texas in 1836, joined the revolutionists, and was commissioned brigadier general in the Texas army. He took part in the disas-

trous attack against Mier in 1842 and was captured and imprisoned at Perote. Three years later he published a book entitled *Journal of the Texian Expedition against Mier; subsequent imprisonment of the author; his sufferings, and final escape from the castle of Perote. With reflections upon the present political and probable future relations of Texas, Mexico, and the United States.* In this volume he gave clear expression to his views on slavery and expansion.

In 1849 he moved on to California, taking slaves with him and engaging in mining. He was elected as a member of the senate of the first legislature, and became a major general of the militia. The nickname, "The legislature of a thousand drinks," is said to have originated from his frequent invitation to his colleagues to come and have a thousand drinks. Elisha O. Crosby, a fellow senator, wrote, many years later: "Outside the chambers a committee was appointed to do the honest hard drinking, with Gen'l Thomas Jefferson Green Chairman (he is dead, peace to his body, which is no doubt well pickled, and immortality to his generous soul)."[1] It may be well to add that he is also credited with having taken, in this legislature, the first step toward the creation of a state university in California. He gave notice on February 6, 1850, that he would at a future date ask leave to introduce a bill to establish and endow a university, and in the next session he reported a correspondence between himself and the Honorable Robert J. Walker, on the nature of a university best suited to California.[2]

The Holmes mentioned in Gadsden's letter is, without much doubt, Isaac Edward Holmes. He was a cousin of James Gadsden, and like him a native of Charleston. A member of the extreme southern group, he was active in the founding of the South Carolina Association to oppose the abolition efforts of the northerners. After several terms as a member of the South Carolina legislature, in 1838 he was elected to Congress, where he served until 1850. In 1851 he removed to California and engaged in the practice of law.

No attempt has been made here to do more than present the document, with a brief account of the principal persons involved. It is felt

[1] Elisha O. Crosby to Hiram T. Grave, Aug. 9, 1883. (Huntington Library, manuscript HM 21251.)

[2] William Warren Ferrier, *Origin and Development of the University of California* (Berkeley, 1930), pp. 11, 15–18.

that it is worth publishing as a piece of evidence that may be of material aid to anyone now or hereafter studying slavery and southern expansion on the Pacific Coast.

JOHN C. PARISH

[James Gadsden to General Thomas Jefferson Green] [1]

My Dear General

Charleston So C
Dec[r] 7 1851

I owe you an Apology for your frequent favors which have remained so long unacknowledge — But in a spirit of procrastination the steamers have passed and caught me unprepared with a letter — I return you my thanks for the papers which contain the history & progress of California: and in which, it has been gratifying to me to see your name conspicuous battling on the same platform we were wont to stand side by side — You can gather from our Papers as much of political news as I can communicate — I am not in the Wigwam. There will be a desperate effort made on both sides to reembody & reorganize the Two Great Parties for the Presidential combat — Donaldson will I fear not profit for his initiatory efforts in the cause: as Blair is in the field & it is said he & Duff Green coalese with a New Paper (to go for the plunder) and to rally on Genl W O Butler: as the True heir & exponent of the Jackson Party — Houston is defunct: and the Donald-[s]on Correspondence bringing him out, has humbugged all who were betrayed into it — The Movement in favor of Butler will be formadable I think: for if any of the Southern States take part they will be more inclined to him as a Slave Owner, than any other who could be named — But as Ritchie used to say — "Nous verrons" —

I was much disappointed at not having rec[d] the result of my Memorial to Your Legislature: enclosed through Holmes and which I expected you to present & take charge of in the Senate — I have written fully to Holmes as to the design which originated it — But if it is responded to favourably You may rest assured it will be the stimulat-

[1] Huntington Library, manuscript LE 470.

ing basis for the Organization of a Colony under my lead — To be prepared therefore we must secure a domain sufficiently large to accommodate a Community by itself: with all the appurt[en]ances of good order & regulated society: excluding interlopers &c. A Colony which is to be the basis and stimulating influences to the permanent & future prosperity of California — Negro Slavery, under Educated & Intelligent Masters can alone accomplish this: — They have been the Pioneers & basis of the civilization of Savage Countries — Without an enduring & well regulated labor the agricultural resources of the Pacific will never be developed — and a profitable agriculture is the foundation of a nations prosperity, happiness & wealth — The Mines may & will prove powerful auxiliaries: & combined with the Cultivation of the Soil must make California all that the Most Sanguine & Even Romantic have pictured. Let us feed our own People & add Cotton Corn & Rice to the Gold export — and No power can vie with that which is washed by the Pacific — So I am in Earnest if you only make the grants — and to be prepared for the future You & Holmes must secure the Domain — I like his location if large enough at the mouth of feather River: but that will be in Northern California: & in a latitude (if the soils are favourable) not adapted to the cultivation most favourable for Slave labor — We must introduce Rice & Cotton & Sugar — and it seems to me that the location of all others most to be desired would be at the Sources of the Joachin: securing the highest navigable point for a *City* — That River if the Map can be relied on affords valley enough for the Cultivation I have named: while it is so hemmed in with Mountains as to bring its rural & cultivable lands within the jurisdiction of the Mines — Our Men could thus at the season for mining be employed in extracting the Gold, while the Women & Boys could raise their food & raiment. What think you of the location & Combination — Now as to the Route — I shall go by land & endeavor to be the Pioneer on the Route I indicated for a Rail Road — Pass up the Red River probably – or take a Route through Texas — from San Antonio — Will you enquire & advise me fully as to the Route Preparations — Time: Difficulties to be encountered & the period most judicious to start — Jack Hayse went out very much on the line I suggest & I think was commissioned to examine & mark out a high way — If so I will only have to follow his blazes — I should like to

know what kind of wheel carriages would be most to be preferred & whether Vehicles can descent the valley of the Gehela — From Mr Cupps accounts I should fear not — As I must move under Military Discipline & arrangement: I will not regard time but look to comfort — I wish the journey to be one of pleasant excitement & not of exposure & suffering — We will halt therefore on every occasion of falling on a valley where both Grass & game abound — Move by slow stages — Make our Road as we go by an organised Corps of Pioneers & Axe men & reach California with both Negroes & animals in full vigor to go to work —

Do write me fully & give all the information on these heads you can gather — Whether the Route is practicable as I propose – or can be made so — Give me an acct of the Joacquin how high & for what depth of water navigable — The character of its Soils & Climate, Whether the banks are high or low & to what extent innundated — How is its health — The Valley of Nappa may be more desirable, but it is occupied: held high & too far I fear from the Gold Regions —

The San Buneventura communicating with Monterey would seem to present admirable Localities — The neighbourhood of San Diego has presented attractions — & the Mouth of the Colorado with the Gila: an imposing[1] Point — How is the Colorado — Any Gold on it or any lands for Cultivation — That Point if accessible would control the Gulf of California — Give me your views & speculations — Fully & extensively — If I lead a Colony it must be with Judgement in all its parts & particularly in the Selection of a location — Your friend

James Gadsden.

General Thomas Jefferson Green[2]
San Francisco
California

[1] The writer accidentally repeated "an imposing."
[2] Address on fold of letter.

List of Contributors

Godfrey Davies	*Editor;* Research Staff, Huntington Library
Campbell, Lily B.	Professor of English, University of California at Los Angeles
Campbell, Oscar James	Professor of English, University of Michigan
Chambers, Raymond Wilson	Professor of English Language and Literature, University College, University of London
Hudson, Hoyt H.	Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, Princeton University
Sherburn, George	Professor of English, The University of Chicago
Ustick, W. Lee	Huntington Library International Research Fellow, 1933–34

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS

ISSUED IN COÖPERATION WITH THE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE LAWS AND LIBERTIES OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1648. Type facsimile, 1929. $5.00
With an Introduction by Max Farrand

SHAKESPEARE'S HAMLET: THE FIRST QUARTO, 1603. Collotype facsimile, 1931. $4.00

THOMAS WYAT'S TRANSLATION OF PLUTARCH'S QUYETE OF MYNDE. Heliotype facsimile, 1931. $2.50
With an Introduction by Charles R. Baskervill

OLIVER GOLDSMITH'S THE GRUMBLER. A TRANSCRIPTION. 1931. $1.50
With an Introduction and Notes by Alice I. Perry Wood

CHRISTMAS CAROLS PRINTED IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY; INCLUDING KELE'S CHRISTMAS CAROLLES NEWELY INPRYNTED, reproduced in facsimile. 1932. $4.00
Edited by Edward Bliss Reed

MARY OF NIMMEGEN. Collotype facsimile, 1932. $2.50
With an Introduction by Harry Morgan Ayres and Adriaan J. Barnouw

BRITTONS BOWRE OF DELIGHTS (1591). Collotype facsimile, 1933. $4.00
With an Introduction and Notes by Hyder Edward Rollins

"TO MARKIE": LETTERS OF ROBERT E. LEE TO MARTHA CUSTIS WILLIAMS. 1933. $1.50
Edited by Avery Craven

THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN

NUMBER 1: MAY, 1931. $2.50
NUMBER 2: NOVEMBER, 1931. $3.50
NUMBER 3: AMERICAN NUMBER, FEBRUARY, 1933. $2.50
NUMBER 4: OCTOBER, 1933. $2.50
NUMBER 5: APRIL, 1934. $2.50
NUMBER 6: NOVEMBER, 1934. $2.50
NUMBER 7: APRIL, 1935. $2.50
NUMBER 8: OCTOBER, 1935. $2.50

THE FOLLOWING REPRINTS FROM THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN ARE AVAILABLE AT THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY ONLY:

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON. BY ROBERT O. SCHAD. $1.00
HUNTINGTON LIBRARY COLLECTIONS. $1.50
MEDICAL INCUNABULA. BY HERMAN RALPH MEAD. $1.00
CHECK LIST OF ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS BEFORE 1801. BY ANTHONY J. GABLER. $1.00

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
RANDALL HALL, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS